INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8520612

Schubert, Deborah David

A SURVEY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHER/COURSE EFFECTIVENESS WITHIN DANCE TECHNIQUE COURSES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW INSTRUMENTATION

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro ED.D. 1985

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A SURVEY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHER/COURSE EFFECTIVENESS WITHIN DANCE TECHNIQUE COURSES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW INSTRUMENTATION

by

Deborah David Schubert

A Dissertation submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1985

Approved by

Sarah M. Robinson
Sarah M. Robinson, Chairperson

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Adviser Sarah M. Robinson
Sarah M. Robinson

Committe Members Rosemary McGee
Rosemary McGee

E. Doris McKinney
E. Doris McKinney

Faitz Mengert
Faitz Mengert

April 1, 1985
Date of Acceptance by Committe

April 30, 1984
Date of Final Oral Examination

SCHUBERT, DEBORAH DAVID, Ed.D. A Survey of Student Evaluations of Teacher/Course Effectiveness within Dance Technique Courses and the Development of New Instrumentation. (1985). Directed by Dr. Sarah M. Robinson. Pp. 121.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness in dance technique courses for the development of new instrumentation. Dance educators at 29 randomly selected universities in the southeast region of the United States completed questionnaires on the use of evaluations within their settings and gave suggestions and recommendations for a form applicable to their needs. Based on the information from the questionnaires, a review of the literature, and a study of the evaluation forms submitted by the dance educators, a new evaluation instrument for dance technique classes was developed.

The Schubert evaluation instrument was tested in 12 dance courses of varying levels and styles over the period of two semesters. Reliability was determined by the test-retest method in eight dance classes during the first semester. Pre and post item and scale correlations ranged from .64 to .89 at the .0001 level of significance. A faculty self-evaluation form was completed by the instructor of each course for a measure of convergent validity. The comparison of the faculty self-ratings with the student ratings resulted in a 79% agreement within the courses the first semester and 88% the second.

A two-way analysis comparing the general items with the specific assessment items provided a measure of content validity for the instrument. The internal consistency measure of

reliability was measured by a scale analysis of the instructor, course, and student-related items. The instructor-related items were found to be the most internally reliable followed by the student and course scales, respectively. It was concluded that the Schubert instrument was a valid and reliable source for the assessment of the instructor and course in the dance technique setting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to my adviser and chairperson, Sally Robinson, for her unending support and encouragement and to the members of my committee for their contributions to this effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the 1960's, the teaching competence of college instructors was typically evaluated, if at all, in an unsystematic fashion. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness for purposes of appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, or salary increase was conducted subjectively by department chairmen, senior faculty, and sometimes by outside evaluators (Scheck, 1978). Many times, evaluations were founded on unreliable, hearsay sources or upon one or two observations of classroom teaching. Quite often, the main criterion for a good "report" was proper appearance, correct attitude, and acceptable behavior or mode of interaction between students, faculty, and administrators.

During the late 1960's, important changes occurred in response to students' demands for a greater voice and participation in university decisions (Scheck, 1978). National surveys since 1966 have shown a steady increase in the percentage of students who feel that faculty promotions should be based more on student evaluations of teaching (Bayer & Dutton, 1976). Increased costs of higher education have also made faculty more accountable for their teaching performance to legislators, taxpayers, and parents (Blank, 1978).

Today, the use of student evaluations is almost nationwide in four-year colleges and universities and many two-year institutions of higher education as well (Scheck, 1978). A standardized, objective rating format, containing attitudinal and behavioral questions, has been most commonly used for evaluations. These rating forms have been attractive to university administrators as a rational, rapid, uniform, and efficient method of ascertaining teaching competence (Scheck, 1978). Administrators, justifying their expenditures of university funding, have used the numerical data from the forms more objectively, and from a more impersonal standpoint to make decisions on tenure, promotion, and reappointment.

Faculty resistance to the use of student evaluations has stemmed partially from the fact that many forms have been developed by student groups, departmental committees, or individuals not associated with the discipline area of the faculty under evaluation (Costin, Greenough, & Menges, 1971). McKeachie (1969), in his review of faculty concerns about student evaluations, stated that ratings are not always helpful to faculty who want to improve their teaching. Standardized forms have often been too general in format and not specific enough to diagnose instructional strengths and weaknesses and, consequently, have lent weight to faculty complaints that ratings serve mainly as a basis for assigning rewards.

Faculty members have also questioned the validity of student evaluations and the methods and circumstances under

which the ratings have been administered. This has been viewed as a critical concern by nontenured faculty members whose evaluations are used by administrators to determine their future employment status. For this reason, it is important that administrators be aware of certain variables which may affect or bias evaluation forms such as class size, whether the course is required or elective, expected grade of the student, faculty and student gender, and class rank (Boyar, 1979; Elmore & Pohlmann, 1978; Hocking, 1976; Korth, 1979; Magoon & Bausell, 1973; and Marsh, Kesler, & Overall, 1979).

Faculty skepticism exists as to whether students are capable and qualified to evaluate an instructor fairly (Gage, 1974). Questions have arisen pertaining to student knowledge of a reliable and valid working definition of effective teaching and if students really know what they want from an instructor and the course (Curry, 1976). Research on student perceptions of their qualifications to evaluate college teaching demonstrates that students feel significantly more qualified to evaluate an instructor's teaching ability concerning clarity and skill of presentation, individual student rapport, and enthusiasm or interest in the subject area, and less qualified to evaluate an instructor's scholarship or knowledge of the subject matter (Glassman & Killait, 1974).

The purposes for which student evaluations of teaching have been applied constitute the basis for positive and negative faculty attitudes. When student evaluations have been used

for administrative purposes in employment related situations, issues have arisen concerning the maintenance of academic standards. One such issue involves the problem of grade inflation where the assertion has been made that a teacher can get "good" ratings simply by assigning good grades or creating the expectancy that they will do so. Studies supporting this statement have indicated that grade leniency by the instructor is a potent factor in receiving higher ratings (Elmore & Pohlman, 1978; Palmer, Carliner, & Romer, 1978). It has also been reported that students give higher ratings when they are more interested in the material and when the grade received is higher than the student's average grade (Costin et al., 1971).

Students generally view their ratings of instruction as making a valuable contribution toward overall teaching effectiveness and feel that all courses and instructors should be evaluated (Purohit & Magoon, 1974). Even with the moral implications surrounding the use of student evaluations, faculty want teaching effectiveness to play a significant role in administrative decisions, but have justifiable concerns regarding the validity of existing measurement forms (Marsh et al., 1979). University administrators have stated that they cannot reward effective teaching until they can evaluate it, and they cannot evaluate it until teachers accept a common measuring instrument and a common set of procedures for administering that instrument (Giordano, 1978).

Is it possible or feasible, however, to have a common instrument? Curry (1976) has stated that different disciplines demand different techniques, and an evaluation form that pretends to embrace every college course will by its nature embrace none and will do a grave disservice to the instructors forced to use it. To satisfy formative needs in evaluation and provide specific teaching criticism, faculty need the freedom to select evaluative criteria to match the settings, goals, and strategies of their instructional environments and methodologies.

A vast majority of evaluative items can be obtained from computer-assisted cafeteria systems (Derry, 1979; Ory, Brandenburg, & Peiper, 1980), or from listings of published rating forms. However, most of these questionnaire items have been constructed for evaluation of lecture-classroom environments and not for activity-participation settings. The majority of research concerning student evaluation of teaching has been based on classroom instructional settings and it is unsafe to assume that findings from classroom research are applicable to activity courses which occur in a broader, freer environment, contain different subject matter, and use movement as the primary medium of learning (Bookhout, 1967).

Very few studies have dealt with the student evaluation of teacher and course effectiveness within the instructional movement setting. Research by Balducci (1978) and Garrison (1977) has involved the study of variables affecting student

rating forms in movement settings and other researchers have used students in physical education activity courses as subjects in testing procedures concerning evaluation forms (Morrow, 1976; Parker, 1980). Colvin and Roundy (1976) and Zakrajsek and Bos (1978) have developed instruments designed specifically for the evaluation of teacher and course competence in physical education activity courses, but, to date, there has been no published research dealing with instrumentation for student evaluation of teacher and course effectiveness in the area of dance.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to survey dance programs in the area of the United States designated as Southern District by the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance to examine the following questions:

1. Have university dance faculty evaluated dance technique courses by the use of student evaluation?
2. If so, what were the content and structure of the forms in use, the method and circumstances under which they were administered, and the processing technique for the data?
3. What were the major purposes of the evaluation form?
4. How were the data used (e.g., instructor/course improvement, tenure assignment, merit pay)?
5. Were the forms thought to be satisfactory for the

purposes intended?

6. Were there any particular problems with the forms in use?
7. To what extent could a common instrument be developed which would be valid, reliable, feasible, practical, and generalizable within the instructional setting of the dance technique course which might offer options or modifications for use within varying skill levels, styles (ballet, modern, or jazz), and classes for dance majors or other students?

Definition of Terms

Dance Technique Course

Instruction in the nonutilitarian form of rhythmic bodily movement which is patterned or stylized according to its educational value as an art form and which is primarily directed toward the development and advancement of technical skill and execution of movement dynamics.

Student Evaluation Form

A rating instrument for determination of students' attitudes toward the course, the instructor, teaching methodology and environment, or (possibly) the learning outcomes.

Teaching Effectiveness

Those characteristics or attributes specific to quality instruction as determined from the students' definition.

Assumptions

Within the present investigation the following assumptions were accepted:

1. That there was no common instrument for student evaluation of teacher and course effectiveness within dance technique courses.
2. That a need existed for an evaluation form specific to dance which was reliable, valid, generalizable, and economically feasible.
3. That dance instructors acknowledged the importance and necessity of evaluation by students.
4. That the faculty selected to participate had been professionally prepared and/or educated to teach within a major, minor, or concentration program in dance.
5. That the criteria for identifying and selecting respondents would yield valid results.

Scope of the Study

The study utilized the services of selected dance faculty within public and private four-year institutions of higher learning in the area of the United States designated as Southern District by the AAHPERD. Members of the faculty

involved in the instruction of dance technique courses were contacted at those institutions offering a program in dance.

The Dancemagazine Directory of College and University Dance, (1978) and the Dance Directory: Programs of Professional Preparation in American Colleges and Universities, (1980) were used as reference listings of institutions applicable to the above criteria for this research. A sample size consisting of 50% of the institutions from each state in the SDAAHPERD was randomly drawn for survey of information.

An appropriate dance representative at each school was contacted and asked to participate and disperse information concerning the study to other dance faculty members within the institution who met the above criteria. Questionnaires on the use of student evaluations in dance technique courses were given to the dance faculty and a request was made to submit to the author current or previously used student evaluation forms. The questionnaires and submitted forms were reviewed and analyzed for the development of new instrumentation. A sizeable number of dance educators and students were asked to participate in procedures to test the validity and reliabillity of the instrument.

Significance of the Study

Faculty and students generally have not been pleased with the evaluation forms in use today. There undoubtedly have been weaknesses in every student rating form ever devised. Questions

on evaluation forms have often been vaguely worded and arbitrarily developed, employing terms which have allowed for several definitions (Curry, 1976).

Fowler and McKenzie (1975) have stated that there is a need to modify the nature and application of course evaluations to make them easier to use and interpret, perhaps thereby increasing the probability that more instructors would use them. Evaluations should be used by the people who most need to improve their teaching such as the inexperienced beginning instructor, the innovative teacher trying new methodologies and technique, or the veteran faculty member teaching a new course. Ory et al.,(1980) have stated that the least experienced instructors have the greatest need for information about themselves and their teaching style and have the most to gain by collecting feedback.

Evaluative items which assess student learning outcomes and attitudes, in relation to teacher behavior and course content, can provide useful information applicable to all levels of faculty experience. Items such as these are valuable in the instructional dance setting, although dance, as a creative and artistic discipline, has always been difficult to evaluate in terms of learning outcomes. The elusive nature of dance, and its flexible, unstructured content in the form of technique, have contributed to the difficulty of pinpointing specific characteristics applicable to all dance settings. Within the medium of dance, learning has been based on student partici-

pation in the form of a movement response to the motivational force and direction of the instructor. Although this type of learning exchange occurs in other activity settings, the overall instruction of dance movement is affected to a greater degree by the response of the student. This response may result in adjustments by the instructor in the movement technique with regard to tempo, rhythm, accent, and level of difficulty.

The ongoing process of teacher/student interaction is different and unique within each dance class. An evaluation form which specifically addresses the creative and changing environment of the dance setting can more effectively assess students' attitudes and feelings toward themselves, the movement, the instructor, and the course.

The general, standardized evaluation form has been inadequate in measuring teacher and course effectiveness within an instructional movement climate such as dance. Forms devised for some activity settings have been more applicable to dance but still do not completely encompass and measure all aspects of the artistic environment. Evaluation forms have been developed by individuals for their own personal use within the area of dance which tap important information on teaching and student concerns. To collect these forms for adaptation to similar situations or other instructional art forms would be worthwhile.

It is important to know what and how much emphasis is placed on student evaluations by dance departments, if the

forms allow and encourage students to state their opinions and comments effectively, and if the faculty members who teach dance technique feel the quality of their instruction has improved with the use of student evaluation forms. Research in this area has been nonexistent and is very much needed. Findings related to this research project could provide information to support or negate the need for a common evaluative instrument applicable for use in dance technique courses. The significance of this study lies in the attempt to explore the use of student evaluation forms specific to dance and in the development of new instrumentation using a research strategy.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Administrator, Faculty, and Student Views Concerning Evaluation

Time-series data of the 1970's indicated an increase in faculty members' support for using teaching performance as a means of evaluation (Blank, 1978). A study assessing college student and faculty attitudes toward course and instructor evaluation showed that a majority of faculty and students felt course evaluations were useful, meaningful, and valuable (Purohit & Magoon, 1974). Many faculty members, however, have not been happy with the evaluation process and have little confidence in the validity of existing measures of teaching effectiveness including those of student evaluations (Marsh et al., 1979).

Blackburn and Clark (1975) reported that faculty members complain more about the manner in which their work is judged and rewarded than about any other dimension of their professional role. Educators have felt that the evaluation of teaching performance is not tailored to their individual interests and talents (Gaff & Wilson, 1971) and that the role of teaching is too complex and subjective to be evaluated (Seldin, 1980). McKeachie (1969), however, has indicated that

the very complexity of the teaching situation makes every bit of empirical information the more precious.

On the other side of the situation, administrators have been frustrated in their attempts to find a justifiable and equitable system for decisions relating to faculty tenure, promotion, and retention. These concerns have intensified due to external and self-induced pressures within the university system. Increasingly, it appears that evaluation of teaching has been based on systematic student ratings and on the content of course syllabi and examinations (Centra, 1980). However, many faculty members have not perceived teaching quality as a major route for advancement but regard teaching load, community work, and publications as the evaluative criteria by which they are judged to a greater extent (Blank, 1978).

According to a survey of the American Council on Education (Astin & Lee, 1967), the most frequent sources used by department chairmen to evaluate teaching are anecdotal reports and a review of scholarly research and publications. Hayes (1981) found that department heads associated good college teaching with research ability but that student evaluations of teaching were not related to the research ability measure. Further, Blank (1978) reported that professional status achieved through publications is directly related to faculty time spent in research and inversely related to the faculty member's amount of undergraduate teaching and extent of orientation toward the institution.

Faculty members who have spent a large amount of time in research activity (five or more publications) increase the social distance between students and faculty and are less likely to support the use of teaching performance as a means of evaluation (Blank, 1978). However, a faculty member with tenure status may not feel as threatened by student evaluation as a nontenured faculty member whose employment status is less secure. Maull (1979) found that nontenured faculty with a rank of assistant professor or instructor perceived a greater loss of autonomy and had less favorable attitudes toward evaluation.

A major issue noted within the literature related to student evaluation concerns the threat to academic privacy whereby faculty are denied the opportunity and the right to be accountable to their own conscience. Proponents of student evaluation have felt that the classroom is no longer the sole domain of the teacher and claim that colleges have a responsibility to ensure the quality of courses and programs offered (Centra, 1980). Curry (1976), Hansen (1976), and Kiernan (1975), along with other critics, have asserted that the administrative use of mandatory student evaluation is immoral and evaluations should not be used for administrative purposes.

In spite of the reservations many faculty members have had concerning student evaluations, there is almost unanimous agreement by faculties that results should be used for improvement of instruction and to a lesser extent to affect

teachers' rewards (Brown, 1978). Emphasis placed on the role of student evaluations in determining such items as salary and retention has increased the chance of apparently forcing the teacher into a position of lowering academic standards to retain employment status with leniency and inflation of grades the result (Blank, 1978; Hocking, 1976).

With regard to legal implications, Kiernan (1975), has stated that until evaluations are adequately validated, they do not comply with Equal Opportunity Commission regulations, and thus suggest that instructors may contest their use in any employment-related situation. She further stated that student ratings should be abolished or returned to their former status as personal feedback for the instructor to aid in self-improvement.

Numerous studies have been done to look at the use of student evaluations and the results in terms of improved teaching. Centra (1972) reported that students' feedback improved the instruction of teachers who had rated themselves more generously than their students. In studies by McKeachie (1969), at the University of Michigan, it was found that student ratings led to teaching improvement. However, the improvement was contingent on specific influences such as teacher motivation, knowledge of how to improve, and whether the rating turned up an appraisal which was new to the teacher.

The issue concerning students' qualifications to provide informational feedback and thus rate the instructional

performance of faculty has been discussed extensively in the literature. A distinct tone of skepticism has been based heavily on faculty perceptions of the presumably low degree of student qualification to make such ratings (Gmelch & Glassman, 1978). Many educators, however, have felt that students are sensitive to the limitations imposed upon their ability to judge an instructor and should not be seen as totally impartial recorders of events but the ultimate consumers of a teacher's efforts.

Students, like other people, respond according to their own values, preferences, and experiences. Within this orientation, Feldman (1977) has stated that some degree of inconsistency is reasonable and reflects individual differences among students. Derry (1979) added that the potential for diverse opinion should be regarded as a strength and not a weakness of students' ratings. Students themselves view their ratings as an important contribution toward course and teacher improvement and feel the ratings should not be elective on the part of the instructor (Purohit & Magoon, 1974).

Other types of faculty evaluation have been researched and comparisons have been made with regard to student rating. In a study conducted by Marsh et al. (1979), faculty members evaluated their own teaching and were then evaluated by their students. Despite faculty reservations about the validity of student ratings, there was considerable student-faculty agreement in the ratings obtained. Self-ratings, as supplement

to student ratings, can provide an opportunity for the instructor to express concerns or relate situations which may have influenced the outcome of the student evaluations. Instructor self-ratings, however, have not been an acceptable alternative where salary considerations or promotions were involved (Costin et al., 1971).

Maslow and Zimmerman (1956) reported on peer or colleague ratings versus student ratings. They found that colleagues tended to equate good teaching with "creativeness", whereas students tended to equate it with "good personality". Aleamoni and Yimer (1973) stated that colleague ratings were significantly related to academic rank, which indicated that the reputation of the instructor could be an influence on colleague ratings. It was also noted that colleague ratings may be affected or influenced by acquaintance, student hearsay, the effect of the instruction on the students, and inferences based on the academic records of the instructor.

An often discussed type of evaluation involves the measurement of student learning outcomes based on specific course objectives and teaching behaviors. Many prominent investigators have ascertained that a form which fails to link students' learning gains to teaching behavior does not in fact measure teaching effectiveness (Gage, 1972). Most studies have found only a low or modest behavior does not in fact measure teaching effectiveness (Gage, 1972). Most studies have found only a low or modest correlation between ratings and

achievement leading some to believe that ratings are not valid (Derry, 1979). Seldom, if ever, has the learning outcomes approach been utilized in higher education today because of the enormous amount of time, energy, and money required to effectively implement this method of evaluation (Scheck, 1978).

Fowler and McKenzie (1975) have suggested an alternative method to the learning outcomes approach which involves a student self-evaluation based not on actual but upon perceived achievement. This process entails asking the students to rate themselves on how well they achieved the stated course objectives. Fowler and McKenzie (1975) conclude that the ultimate type of course evaluation would perhaps be a combination of some items calling for a rating of instructor behavior, student self-rating of achievement, actual student performance, and peer evaluation.

Validity and Reliability of Student Rating Forms

The majority of articles dealing with student evaluation of teacher and course effectiveness concerns research which supports or negates the validity and reliability of forms used within academic settings. Authors of studies which conclude that evidence for the validity and utility of rating forms exist are subsequently quick to point out that the forms are by no means perfect but can be used to foster instructional improvement.

Considerable evidence has been reported that students are reliable raters of their instructors and there is consistency of rating scores (Costin et al., 1971; Touq & Feldhusen, 1974). Typical measures of split-half reliability consistently show that the instruments employed in student ratings have a high reliability (Seldin, 1980). It is important to realize, however, that although the reliabilities of average college student ratings have tended to be high in a majority of studies, this does not mean that students within classes were highly consistent in their ratings (Feldman, 1977).

Research has established that student rating forms are a function of instructional performance, student characteristics, and situational variables (Feldhusen & Mazzuca, 1979). With regard to instructional performance, administrators and faculty are concerned about whether students as a group can identify reliably the "effective" teacher by a common criterion of performance characteristics.

In order to establish the criterion validity of student evaluation, research must show that evaluations are systematically related to acceptable criteria of instructional quality rather than factors unrelated to teaching excellence (Marsh, et al., 1975). Factor analysis studies have consistently demonstrated that the items on teacher rating forms can be summarized by statements which assess knowledge of subject, skill in presentation, interest in subject, student-teacher interaction, and course organization; these

appear to be replicable and important components of teacher behavior (Schultz, 1978; Touq & Feldhusen, 1974).

Student characteristics, impressions, biases, and predispositions as related to the teacher and the course can invariably affect ratings. To define a specific population of students is difficult when they are rarely assigned randomly to course sections and can therefore differ systematically in ways that affect their ratings of teachers (Leventhal, Abrami, & Perry, 1976). Due to individual characteristics, a rating form validated for one particular group may not be valid for a different group.

Extraneous factors or situational variables related to student ratings have been observed. Labeled as "peek-a-boo" phenomena, they persist in one study but not in another (Schultz, 1978). A variable that has consistently appeared in the results of a number of studies, and is significantly related to rating forms, involves the final grade which a student expects to receive (Feldman, 1977; First, 1978; Korth, 1979; Painter & Granzin, 1972; Stumpf & Freedman, 1979; Torabi, 1979). Generally, students expecting A's rate most favorably, B's next highest, and C's the lowest (Parker, 1980).

Painter and Granzin (1972) have studied students who revise their grade expectation during a course Their "consistency theory" suggests that if students perceive their performance to be inconsistent with early expectations, they may change the evaluation. Results from this study indicate

that students who did revise their grade expectation, significantly, more often than not shifted their evaluation in the same direction.

A basic evaluative component affecting teacher ratings, which is largely beyond the control of the instructor, concerns agreement of the course experience with the prior interest and expectations which the student holds upon entering the course. Findings suggest that subject matter affect (the degree to which the student likes the subject) has the strongest relationship with expected grade (Torabi, 1979) and is positively correlated with end-of-course ratings of instruction (Barke, Tollefson, & Tracy, 1983; Feldman, 1977; Guthrie, 1954; Hocking, 1976; Marsh et al., 1979). Barke et al. (1983) reported greater validity of student ratings if students had fewer expectations or biases that potentially could influence end of course ratings. They also found that when students expressed only course-related versus teacher-related attitudes, end of course ratings became less predictable.

Inconsistent findings have been reported on variables related to ratings concerning student-teacher gender interactions, grade point average, student classification, and major area of study. In a thorough review by Costin et al. (1971), no significant differences were found in the studies examined on ratings by male and female students. Most studies in which rating differences between males and females were statistically significant found that women students rated the

teacher or course higher than did men (Feldman, 1977; Haslett, 1976; Parker, 1980). Both male and female students expected significantly higher grades from female instructors; however, female students expected lower grades from male instructors than did male students (Parker, 1980).

Walker (1969) found that female students rated female teachers significantly higher than they rated male instructors. College males were reported to be more confident in themselves as students than were females and the effect of student gender on evaluations varied as a function of the particular aspect of instruction being evaluated (Haslett, 1976). Feldman (1977) added that gender interactions may not be a particularly common occurrence where certain effects arise in specific kinds of situations in which such interactions are to be expected.

Many studies have reported the lack of any significant relationship of grade point average to course ratings of instruction (Feldman, 1977; Garrison, 1977; Granzin and Painter, 1973; Rayder, 1967). Korth (1979), however, found that students give higher ratings when the grade received is higher than the students grade point average. When a positive relationship to grade point average is reported, Palmer (1978) suggested that the brighter students with the higher point averages may seek out the better instructors.

Investigations concerning the relationship of student classification or year in school to student ratings report inconsistent findings. Positive associations tend to outnumber

the negative, and several studies have found that upperclassmen generally give higher ratings than underclassmen (Downie, 1952; Feldhusen & Macuzza, 1979; Gage, 1961). An explanation, noted by Frey, Leonard, and Beatty, (1975), may be that students lower their expectations as they encounter less competent or stimulating instructors during their first few years in stimulating instructors during their first few years in college.

Findings reported by First (1978), stated that graduate students give the lowest ratings and sophomores the highest while Granzin and Painter (1973) and Torabi (1979) found no significant relationship between academic year and student ratings. Torabi (1979) also reported that differences in areas or major fields of study did not significantly influence ratings. First (1978) noted a significant difference and reported that "professional" disciplines give lower ratings than those in the arts and sciences. In accordance with these findings, Centra and Creech (1976) found slightly higher student ratings of course value and teacher effectiveness in the field of humanities versus the social and natural sciences.

A number of studies have reported that students give higher ratings to major courses within their field of study (Centra & Creech, 1976; Feldman, 1977). Haslett (1976) supported these data with his observation that the more knowledgeable the student is in an area, the higher the ratings of instructor and course. With regard to core classes,

generally required for the underclassman population, ratings given were lower than those of the noncore classes (Whitten & Umble, 1980). Concerning the level of course difficulty and student ratings, Torabi (1979) reported no significant relationship while Haslett (1976) found advanced courses generally received higher ratings.

Large classes have systematically received lower course ratings than those with a smaller number of students (Elmore & Pohlmann, 1978; Korth, 1979; Torabi, 1979; Whitten & Umble, 1980). Faculty members frequently suggest that teachers of large classes may receive lower ratings because students generally prefer small classes which permit more student-teacher interaction (Costin et al., 1971). Smaller classes are sometimes perceived by students as having a greater feeling of good will between student and teacher.

Other investigators have felt that the relationship between class size and student ratings of instruction may vary according to the particular aspect of teaching performance the student is asked to rate (Guthrie, 1954; Haslett, 1976). In one example of this, noted in a study by Haslett (1976), it was found that small classes were rated as having significantly fairer evaluation methods than large or moderate classes. As a note of interest, Korth (1979) reported that classes held in a convenient place and at a convenient time for students were generally rated higher.

A majority of studies have found that teachers of elective courses generally receive higher ratings (Boyar, 1979; Feldman, 1977; Feldhusen & Mazzuca, 1979; Korth, 1979; Torabi, 1979; Whitten & Umble; 1980). Magoon and Bausell (1973) reported that students indicate relatively lighter workloads within a more relaxed atmosphere in elective courses but these were perceived as less relevant than the required courses.

Reasons for selecting a course may have some influence on the outcome of instructor ratings. Although some students are predisposed to rate courses and instructors higher than other students, initial impressions and pre-course information appear to be related to ratings (Feldman, 1977). Students who choose a class based on pre-course information, concerning the reputation of the instructor, give higher ratings than students who choose a course for other reasons (Centra & Creech, 1976; First, 1978; Leventhal et al., 1976). When results are public, students also tend to select the most highly rated course despite the greater amount of work reported (Coleman & McKeachie, 1981; Korth, 1979).

An investigation by First (1978) found significant differences in evaluations based on the course load of students with part-time students tending to evaluate their instructors lower. He also reported that students who enrolled expecting an easy grade and who subsequently did not receive one gave lower ratings.

Many studies have compared students' ratings to academic faculty rank or length of teaching experience. Delaney (1977) found no significant relationship between academic rank and instructor ratings but did report a curvilinear relationship between years of teaching experience and ratings as did Guthrie (1954). Downie (1952) reported that full professors tended to receive higher student ratings than did other ranks and Gage (1961) found that associate professors and full professors received significantly higher ratings than did instructors or assistant professors. Balducci (1978) compared student ratings for activity and theory classes and reported that students rated professors the highest and assistant professors the lowest in activity classes while instructors were rated the highest and full professors the lowest in theory classes.

With regard to teaching load, full-time instructors were found to have higher ratings than part-time instructors (Torabi, 1979). An analysis of ratings by Centra and Creech (1976) of more than 8,000 teachers indicated that teachers with a credit hour load of 13 or more received the highest ratings.

The relationship of instructor ratings to research productivity has been investigated by a number of people, some of whom report that professors who publish research receive higher ratings (Bresler, 1968; McGrath, 1962; Riley, Ryan, & Lifschitz, 1950). On the other hand, Guthrie (1954), Hayes (1971), and Aleamoni and Yimer (1973) found no significant

relationship between research productivity and ratings of teacher effectiveness.

A frequent argument against the use of ratings involves the concern that students may judge instruction on the basis of its "entertainment" value rather than on its informational value or contribution to learning (Costin et al., 1971; Granzin & Painter, 1973). This concern has been based on the "educational seduction theory", which stated that an entertaining charismatic lecturer speaking deliberate nonsense received surprisingly high evaluations. It was suggested that students taught by instructors who lacked such traits as enthusiasm, humor, or friendliness may be rated more severely on lecture content than their actual achievement would justify (Perry, Abrami, & Leventhal 1979).

In support of ratings, Guthrie (1954) found that teachers who obtained the highest evaluations were also "substance" teachers and not merely entertainment oriented, and that student ratings may reflect an index of good and substantial teaching along with the popularity of a teacher. He also noted that students were particularly fond of instructors who seemed to be highly interested in their courses and exhibited teacher warmth.

The issue of rating forms having more validity if signed or anonymously completed has been the subject of several studies. Costin et al. (1971) stated in his review that a guarantee of anonymity or immunity would seem to be mandatory,

especially when ratings are administered prior to final grading. Stone, Rabinowitz, and Spool (1977) suggested that the concern for anonymity is probably based on the belief that in the absence of anonymity students have a tendency to bias upward their evaluations. However, there is no published data showing that signed student ratings of faculty performance differ from unsigned student ratings with respect to bias. Stone et al. (1977) also reported no difference in the proportion of students willing to complete signed as opposed to unsigned evaluations and concluded that signed rating forms may provide more detailed feedback from individuals who perceive their signed ratings as having greater importance and thus feel more involved in the process.

Another topic which has been investigated concerns the timing of evaluations. Carrier, Howard, and Miller (1974) reported that students attending the last regular meeting of a college course gave more favorable instructor and course evaluations than those attending the final exam only. However, Frey (1976) found that ratings collected before the final exam were not significantly different from ratings collected after the students received their final grade. No significant difference was noted in ratings administered early and late in the term (Kohlan, 1973).

In conclusion, findings have demonstrated that student evaluations collected at the end of a course are markedly similar to the retrospective ratings of alumni several years

later (Centra, 1974; Overall and Marsh, 1980). Results seem to indicate that judgements made by students at the end of a course are fairly permanent in nature.

The Composition of Rating Instruments

In a survey conducted by Penfield (1978), it was reported that rating forms are generally constructed in a way that provides an effective means of evaluating instruction. Critics of evaluation instruments have stated that too many forms appear disorganized and arbitrarily developed and contain questions that are vague and ambiguous (Curry, 1976). At most universities, research on rating instruments has not kept pace with the decisions that are ultimately based on them (Bejar, 1975). No form is perfect and there are drawbacks to almost any instrument in use today. Confusion and variation in the construction of rating forms exist even though colleges and universities have used student ratings to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction for the past four decades.

Specifically, an instrument might be judged for (a) the type of behavior it addresses, (b) simplicity of use and scoring, including the cost of collecting and scoring the data, and (c) usefulness of feedback. With regard to the type of behavior a form addresses, it is important to identify the facets of an instructional domain or program deemed important and worthy of measurement. These facets or elements contain

characteristics of the course and instructor that are used to assess the outcome of the program and provide a content guide for generating items.

Characteristics may be manifested in the form of course content, student achievement, instructional methods, or presentation (Beck, 1979). Although a common core of facets and elements could be extracted from most programs of higher education, the type of institution and the nature of the program will influence the content or the behavior that a form addresses.

Factor analytic studies of student ratings, published over the past 25 years, have identified several common groups of items descriptive of an effective or "good" teacher (Centra, 1973; Crawford & Bradshaw, 1968; Gadzella, 1968). Those items appearing in a majority of research and most frequently used in rating scales are (a) course organization and structure, (b) teacher-student interaction or rapport, (c) teaching skill, communication, or lecturing ability, and (d) enthusiasm, energy, and interest in the subject.

With regard to use and expense of rating forms, Beck (1979) has recommended that numerical scales be used for course and instructor evaluation as this type of scale is easy to construct, administer, analyze, and interpret. Thousands of ratings can be analyzed inexpensively, efficiently, and accurately by optical scanners with the use of separate answer sheets.

The usefulness of feedback depends largely upon the degree to which items are stated in specific terms. Unfortunately, many forms are characterized as being so general that they have little diagnostic ability. For summative purposes, when administrators must recommend promotion, tenure, or salary adjustments, a standardized form is preferred where measures can be applied uniformly to all teachers and their courses. For formative reasons a form is used to diagnose instructional strengths and weaknesses. Historically, the summative and formative needs have not been met by a single, standardized form.

Items of a summative nature, often termed "global" ratings, do provide valid information and are a necessary part of an evaluation instrument (Derry, 1979). Along with giving students the responsibility for making summative judgements, they serve as conceptual anchor points from which diagnostic ratings deviate. Centra (1980) adds that global ratings may be more valid estimates of student learning because they are not tied to a specific instructional style.

While formative and summative purposes place conflicting demands on the composition of the rating form, conflict can be minimized by permitting the faculty at least partial control over the content of the evaluation (Derry, 1979). Computer-managed item blanks, often called the "cafeteria-style format system", provide the faculty with the opportunity to select specific rating items to meet diagnostic needs. Derry

(1979), however, has cautioned on the use of such a selection system for the total design of a rating instrument in that faculty members who choose to ask questions about their strengths and not their weaknesses may induce students to award higher global ratings than might otherwise be given.

A study conducted by Ory, Brandenburg, and Peiper (1980) looked at the item areas chosen by faculty using the cafeteria-style format. They found that the higher-rated faculty selected both fewer course-management items and student-preference-for-instructor-learning items than did lower-rated faculty. Conversely, higher-rated faculty selected more student-outcome items than did lower-rated faculty. As academic rank increased, selection percentages of instructor-characteristic items decreased.

When given the option of selecting a certain number of questions for inclusion in a rating instrument, the cafeteria system can provide items which are specific, clearly defined, and of low inference. This can help to improve the accuracy and stability of rating scales. Other strategies that can be employed to generate items, in addition to writing items from scratch based on the domain specifications or using the cafeteria-style format, include adopting a previously developed instrument to the specifications needed or adopting a previously developed instrument intact (Beck, 1979). Doyle and Wattawa (1977) have recommended the practice of custom-making questionnaires and rating scales which reflect the important

aspects of teaching that are specific to individual courses. This idea may be more in keeping with traditional conceptualizations of validity than is the widely used practice of administering the same "standard" questionnaire to students in any or all courses in an institution.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

To investigate the use of student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness, a random sample was drawn of regionally selected college and universities offering a program in dance. Members of the dance faculty at those institutions were asked to participate by completing a questionnaire about the use of evaluations and a biographical profile sheet on their training and education. The results of the two forms, along with a review of related literature and the analysis of submitted evaluation forms were used in the development of new instrumentation specific to dance technique classes. The evaluation instrument was tested over two semesters at a given university to obtain measures of reliability and validity.

Selection of Subjects and Introductory Correspondence

The sample population for this research consisted of public and private four year colleges and universities within the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia which offered an instructional program in dance. A random sample was drawn from this population to select 50% of the institutions from each state.

The final sample contained 71 institutions. Each school was contacted by means of an introductory letter addressed to an appropriate dance representative which explained the purpose, procedures, and intent of the study (see Appendix A). A postage paid response card was enclosed within this letter to encourage a prompt reply on the decision of the dance representative to participate within the research.

A total of 31 dance representatives within 29 of the responding institutions agreed to participate for a 41% return. Letters of acknowledgment (see Appendix B) were mailed to each respondent along with an informed consent form, a biographical profile sheet, and a questionnaire on the use of student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness in dance technique courses (see Appendixes C, D, and E, respectively).

The letter of acknowledgment expressed gratitude for the subject's willingness to participate and requested that respondents submit an evaluation form used in their own setting. The letter also explained the use of an individually assigned code number on all correspondence to maintain anonymity and ensure confidentiality.

Signatures were requested on the informed consent form which stated that participation was voluntary. Procedures and conditions were clarified to enhance understanding by the subjects. Signatures on this form were obtained from the dance representatives who agreed to participate.

Biographical Profile Sheet

Background information about the dance representatives was obtained by the use of the biographical profile sheet. This information provided a useful composite on teaching experience, expertise, and educational background of the dance educator.

According to the literature, variables such as teaching experience, rank, and course load have been shown to affect faculty attitudes concerning the use of teacher and course evaluations. The biographical information was, therefore, useful in helping to understand and interpret the results from the questionnaire.

A summary of the responses to the profile sheet showed 87% of the 31 dance representatives to be female with an average age of 41. The rank or title of associate or full professor was held by 51% of the faculty with another 46% divided between the instructor and assistant professor levels. An assumption was made that over 50% of the respondents had obtained tenure status based upon the academic rank indicated.

The highest earned degree, recorded by 44% of the faculty, was a Master of Arts or a Master of Fine Arts; 25% noted the attainment of doctoral degrees with the usual date of completion near the time of 1969. The school attended by the largest percentage of those completing the biographical form was the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (48%). A

total of 21 other institutions had been attended by the teachers.

The average length of teaching experience at the college and university level was 14 years. Experience at the public and private school levels of K-6 and 7-12 was 38% and 48%, respectively, for an average of two years. An average of 7 1/2 years was spent by 30% of the educators teaching in private studios, and 39% listed work with a professional dance company for an average of 4 1/2 years. These statistics indicate that a large percentage of the educators in this study have had a broad base of experience in teaching and performing outside of the university setting.

A majority of the educators had taught modern dance at the beginning (81%), intermediate (70%), and advanced (56%) levels and the beginning level of ballet (53%). A smaller percentage had teaching experience in intermediate ballet (30%) and advanced ballet (20%) with beginning, intermediate, and advanced jazz dance experience noted at 26%, 16%, and 15%, respectively. The average length of teaching experience in modern dance was 11 years, ballet 9 years, and jazz 7 years. The highest average enrollments were as follows: modern dance, 25; beginning and intermediate ballet, 22; beginning jazz, 19; and intermediate jazz, 24. Advanced ballet and modern averaged the smallest enrollments with 13 and 15, respectively.

A teaching load comprised of 50% or more in dance technique courses was held by 56% of the educators. These results

indicate that the educators in this study were actively engaged in the instruction of dance technique at the time they completed the questionnaire.

Questionnaire on the Use of Student Evaluations

The questionnaire about the use of student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness in dance technique courses (see Appendix E) was constructed to examine the questions posed within the "statement of the problem" for this research. The questionnaire was also developed for the purpose of gathering information for the construction of a new evaluation instrument specific to the needs and settings of the individuals participating within the study.

A total of 30 questionnaires was completed (two dance representatives at one institution each completed a questionnaire). A summary of the results from the questionnaires indicated that 76% of the dance educators were using student evaluations of teacher/course effectiveness in one or more of their dance technique courses. These educators completed the first part of the questionnaire (n = 23).

A large percentage of the educators (78%) were required by their administration or university to evaluate and administer evaluations. A majority (65%) administered evaluations each semester or quarter in which the technique course was offered, with the remaining respondents evaluating the course

once each academic year or selecting one section of the same course for evaluation per semester.

The campus-wide standardized form was the most common type of evaluation used by 43% of the educators, with another 22% using a standardized form developed specifically for each department. Over half of the instructors (52%) administered the evaluations themselves and had another individual collect the forms. A majority of 65% indicated that they left the room while the students completed the evaluation.

Computer processing of the evaluation form was the most commonly used method of tabulation; 70% of the participants noted this method. Individuals who were given access to the results were: (1) the department chairperson (91%); (2) the dance chairperson (43%); and, (3) the faculty instructor of the course being evaluated (96%). Results of the student evaluation form were not available to 60% of the educators until their final grades were submitted.

The dance representatives indicated that they had administered student evaluation forms in the following classes:

	Modern	Ballet	Jazz
Beginning	87%	65%	35%
Intermediate	83%	48%	22%
Advanced	57%	26%	9%

These percentages were similar to those concerning the educators' length of teaching experience noted on the biographical profile sheet. The dance forms and technique levels

which had been taught by a majority of the educators were also the courses in which a large percentage had administered student evaluations. Similarly, the courses in which a smaller percentage of teachers had indicated teaching experience were also those evaluated by a lesser percentage of the educators.

The dance representatives indicated that student evaluations were most often used in their settings for the following purposes:

1) Teacher and course improvement (91%)
2) Assignment of tenure (74%)
3) Promotion (74%)
4) Salary increases (65%)
5) Assignment of merit pay (57%)
6) Appointment (22%)
7) Professional leave (9%)

The representatives indicated that evaluations <u>should</u> be used for the following purposes:

1) Teacher and course improvement (83%)
2) Assignment of tenure (61%)
3) Promotion (65%)
4) Salary increases (52%)
5) Merit pay (43%)
6) Appointment (35%)
7) Professional leave (22%)

There was a slight drop in the percentage of educators who felt that evaluations should be used for teacher and course

improvement. With the considerable length of teaching experience of many of the educators in this study, the need for a form addressing this purpose may have no longer been of such great importance. A similar decline, averaging 12%, was noted in the educators' responses to the remaining purposes with the exception of appointment and professional leave each of which increased 13%.

Responses to statements descriptive of the evaluation forms used by the educators were as follows:

1) Provides feedback for teacher improvement (78%)
2) At least 80% of the form is completed by the students (78%)
3) Provides feedback on class environment (65%)
4) Questions are stated fairly and are unbiased in structure (61%)
5) Provides feedback for course improvement (70%)
6) Allows expression for student concerns (70%)
7) Questions are clearly understood by students (43%)
8) Identifies student learning outcomes (17%)
9) Specific to the dance environment (9%)
10) Identifies students' self-concepts (4%)

According to the responses above, the evaluation forms used by this population of educators provide adequate feedback for teacher and course improvement and satisfactorily allow for expression of student concerns. But the forms are not suitable

for the dance setting and do little to identify student learning outcomes or self-concepts.

In general, 57% of the educators were not satisfied with the student evaluation form they used; however, 61% stated that student evaluations had improved the quality of their teaching. The two most common recommendations or suggestions for an evaluation form that would meet their needs were for a form more specific to the dance activity setting and extended space for written comments. Other suggestions included the request for a form which would identify student concerns and learning outcomes and the freedom to add outside evaluative items more appropriate to the course.

The second part of the questionnaire was answered by those dance representatives who were not currently administering student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness in their dance technique courses ($n = 7$). A majority (71%) had used student evaluations at one time with an average date of previous use around 1980-81.

The intermediate levels of modern and jazz dance along with the advanced levels of modern, ballet, and jazz were courses in which 14% of the educators had administered evaluations. The beginning and advanced levels of modern and jazz had been evaluated by 29% of the educators and ballet at the beginning and intermediate levels by 43%.

The reasons most frequently stated for not using student evaluations were the nonavailability of an appropriate form and

the lack of a requirement by the department or administration to evaluate the course. Responses to the question on recommendations for a form appropriate to their needs included those for an evaluation that would be specific as well as general and the repeated request for written comment space. A high percentage of these educators (86%) stated that they would use a student evaluation form if one were developed for their specific needs and purposes.

Development of New Instrumentation

The development and construction of the student evaluation form to determine teacher and course effectiveness in dance technique classes was based on information and research from three primary sources. The first source consisted of a compilation of numerous research studies and articles on the reliability and validity of evaluation forms and instrument designs. The second source was gained from the results of the questionnaires on the use of student evaluations by dance educators at selected institutions. An analysis by the investigator of the content and structure of 24 evaluation forms submitted by the dance representatives formed the third source. Student evaluation instruments from other college institutions and testing centers in the United States were also studied and used as a reference source for the construction of the new form (see Appendix F).

The Schubert Student Evaluation of Instructor and Course for Dance Technique Classes was developed and printed for a pamphlet style format (see Appendix G). The form was organized into seven sections:

1) General information items
2) Instructor assessment items
3) Course assessment items
4) Personal (student) assessment items
5) General or global items
6) Supplementary items selected by instructor
7) Short answer questions with "yes or no" responses

Based on a study of the literature concerning variables affecting student evaluations, items 1-9 in the general information section were included for information on the students' gender, classification, grade point average, reasons for selecting the course, and interest in the subject. For the purpose of validity, a larger number of informational items than indicated necessary by the literature was included. It was assumed by this researcher that some of the items would be deleted after the form was tested.

Those specific and general assessment items which appeared in a majority of the collected and submitted evaluation forms, and those which assessed characteristics of the dance environment necessary to the needs of the faculty participants, were selected or developed for use in the instrument. The instructor items 10-20, the course items 21-26, and the

personal or student items 27-31 were used to assess specific characteristics or aspects related to instruction of the course. Each of the three categories of specific (formative) assessment items were regarded as scales within the instrument. The general or global (summative) assessment items 32-35 were included for a measure of comparison between their mean values and the corresponding specific assessment items or scale means.

The decision to include a section for supplementary questions was based upon a study of the literature and requests from the faculty participants answering the earlier questionnaire. Although supplementary questions were not supplied by the dance instructor for the testing phase of the instrument, this section was deemed important for the collection of specific information related to individual methods of instruction, course requirements, and identification of student learning outcomes.

The instructor of each class participating in the testing of the instrument was given a list of optional items for possible future use within the supplementary section (see Appendix H). The list contained items which had been tested and used in other evaluation forms. The instructors were also informed of the option of formulating their own questions using the list as a reference and model for the type of format and phrasing applicable to their needs.

The items developed for use within the written comment section were based on the suggestions and needs of the faculty

participants. A study of the short-answer questions from the evaluation forms submitted in the sample survey also influenced the construction of this section. The written comment section and the "yes or no" responses were printed on an insert page of the pamphlet. The comments on this page could be collected apart from the remainder of the questionnaire and made available to those individuals allowed access to the results. The remainder of the evaluation pamphlet could therefore be reused by requiring only the extra printing of the insert page. The yes or no remarks, along with the responses to the other items on the questionnaire, were recorded on a commercially available general-purpose answer sheet which could be electronically scanned.

The use of the descriptive scale, "agree-disagree", was found to be the most commonly used and effective means of reply for this type of evaluation instrument. The "not-applicable or don't know" category was used rather than the "neutral" response item because of the research which indicated that the neutral response had been marked rather frequently by those individuals who preferred to complete a form quickly or by those who viewed the category as an easy way to avoid decisions regarding each statement (Berk, 1979).

Testing of the Evaluation Instrument

The new Schubert evaluation instrument was administered in eight dance technique courses within one university. A decision was made to test the instrument in one location over a

period of two semesters in place of the initial plan to test at the various institutions which had participated in the questionnaire phase of the study. Time restrictions along with problems of logistics in the control of format and procedures when administering the form were concerns which contributed to this decision.

Two weeks prior to the last day of class, the instrument was tested in two beginning, one intermediate, and one advanced level of modern dance, one beginning and one intermediate level of ballet, and two beginning levels of jazz dance. A verbal introduction of the nature and purpose of the research was made to the students in each class. Voluntary participation and anonymity of the students response was also emphasized in the introductory message. The student's personal identification number was used as a means of matching pre- and postevaluation forms for the data on reliability. The students who agreed to participate signed an informed consent form before they completed the evaluation instrument (see Appendix I).

The instructor of each dance course which participated within this phase of the research completed a faculty self-evaluation form (see Appendix J). Four instructors, teaching two courses each, completed the self-evaluation form. This information was useful in the validation, interpretation, and analysis of statistical results from the evaluation instrument. Thus, assumptions or associations could be clarified about specific data as related to special concerns or teaching prob-

lems experienced by the instructor of the course. This form also provided insight as to how the instructor viewed the students with regard to their level of technique, motivation or interest, and general class attitude.

One week after the initial data collection, the evaluation form was again administered to a portion of the students in each class who had completed the form the previous week (n = 68). The number of students completing the form a second time was dictated by those willing to donate their time. Reliability data was collected from this phase of the research.

The following semester the evaluation instrument was administered in two courses of beginning-level modern dance and two courses of beginning-level jazz dance a week prior to the last day of class. The same procedures were followed as in the initial testing the previous semester. The retest procedure was not repeated as adequate data had been collected the previous semester on the reliability of the form.

The responses to the questionnaires, recorded on the general purpose answer sheets, were scanned by an optical computerized system. The system transferred the data from the answer sheets onto a magnetic computer tape which was placed on file in the data bank. The computer programs titled Statistical Analysis System (SAS) and Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used to obtain the appropriate statistical information for measuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation form.

In conclusion, several primary sources were used in the development of the Schubert instrument. The form was structured for the dance activity setting to provide feedback for course and instructor improvement and to allow for the expression of student concerns. Considerations of practicality (printing and processing costs), adaptability (to various levels of technique and styles of dance), and brevity (time taken to complete the form) were taken into account. In addition, satisfactory test-retest reliability (stability) had been achieved to encourage the next phase of analysis.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The Schubert Evaluation of Instructor and Course for Dance Technique Classes was administered in eight dance classes during a fall semester. The combined data from the courses have been referred to as Group 1 with individual courses labeled with a letter from A through H. The evaluation instrument was again administered in four dance classes the following semester with the combined data referred to as Group 2. Each of the classes within this group have been labeled with a number and letter from 2A through 2D.

Analysis of General Information Section

An analysis of the data from Group 1, concerning item 1 on student classification, showed an even distribution in enrollment of freshmen (26%), sophomores (22%), juniors (31%), and seniors (18%) with graduate students (3%) comprising a small portion of the classes. A similar spread was noted for Group 2 among the classifications of freshman (19%), sophomores (29%), juniors (27%), and seniors (21%) with a low percentage of graduate level students in attendance.

Responses to item 2 indicated that 84% of the students in Group 1 and 91% of those in Group 2 were female. The enrollment of male students was relatively low with no notice-

able difference in the number attending the different levels of technique classes.

Item 3 requested information concerning grade point average. Of the students in Groups 1 and 2, 50% to 60% listed their grade point averages in the range of 2.50 to 3.49 and 13% to 17% in the range of 3.50 to 4.00. These averages seem to indicate that a majority of the students enrolled were secure in terms of their academic standing. The percentage of students who did not have a grade point average fell from 13% in Group I to 4% in Group 2 explainable by the larger number of first semester freshman in attendance during the initial testing of the instrument.

Item 4 requested information as to the number of hours of practice the students participated in outside of class per week. The practice hours were found to increase in relation to the technique level of the course. Students in the beginning levels of modern and jazz dance averaged one hour of practice outside of class per week, the intermediate modern class for three hours, and the advanced modern class practiced four to five hours per week. The beginning and intermediate levels of ballet indicated practice hours of two and three, respectively. Overall, 26% of the students in Groups 1 and 2 responded that no practice was done outside of class, 42% averaged one hour per week, 24% two hours, and 18% three hours or more.

Answers to item 5 indicated that 59% of the students in Group 1 and 71% of those in Group 2 took the dance course on a general elective basis with less than 10% of the students in either group responding to the other categories. In comparison to the other dance courses in this study, the intermediate and advanced levels of modern dance technique showed a larger enrollment of students who were fulfilling major degree requirements for their programs in dance. In response to item 6, approximately 80% of the students in Groups 1 and 2 listed interest in the subject as their most important reason for taking the dance course. Due to the large number which selected the course as an elective, it was not surprising that a majority of the students reported that they chose the course for this reason.

With regard to item 7, expected grade in the course, 67% of the students in Group 1 expected to receive the grade of A and 27% the grade of B. Group 2's expectation in the A category was slightly lower at 57% and 33% in the B range. Very few of the students expected to receive a C, D, or failing grade in the course. If the previous information concerning grade point average is taken at face value, a majority of the students were adept at earning higher grades.

Information gathered from items 8 and 9 indicated that interest levels in the dance course remained high from before the semester to after. Group 1 showed a slight drop in interest from a high rating of 71% before the course to 64%

after. Group 2 noted an increase in their high rating of interest from 58% before to 69% after the course. It is interesting to note that the data from items 5 through 9 support the literature which states that when a course is taken on an elective versus a required basis, there is usually a higher level of interest in the subject and the student generally expects to receive a higher grade.

Analysis of General with Specific Items: Content Validity

A review of the analysis of variance, between the general or global assessment items with the corresponding specific assessment items, provided information on the content validity of the instrument. Parametric and nonparametric tests were used to obtain measures of relationship. As noted in Table 1, correlations computed by the Pearson productmoment technique and the Spearman coefficient of rank correlation method were comparatively similar with an average amount of shared variance of .04 for each group. The variance of the error of prediction, or r^2, was computed to give the percentage of variance for each specific assessment item which could be predicted from the variance of the corresponding global or general assessment item.

Item 32, which requested the student's personal rating on level of technique, was correlated with items 4 through 7

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF GENERAL WITH SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT ITEMS

Group	Pearson's r (1)	Pearson's r (2)	r^2 (1)	r^2 (2)	Spearman rho (1)	Spearman rho (2)
Item 32 Level of Technique						
by 4 Outside Practice	-.14	-.20	2.0	4.0	-.17	-.19
by 5 Course Required/Elective	.22	.00	4.8	0.0	.18	-.02
by 6 Reason Course Selected	.10	-.05	1.0	0.3	.13	-.06
by 7 Expected Grade	.20*	.31****	4.0	9.6	.33	.47
by 31 Appropriate Skill/Prereq.	.26****	.19****	6.8	3.6	.32	.26
Item 33 Effort for Course						
by 27 Assistance With Technique	.13	-.06****	1.7	0.4	.18	-.04
by 28 Positive Attitude	.38****	.11**	14.4	1.2	.41	.18
by 29 Improvement Encouraging	.24****	.26****	5.8	6.8	.29	.27
by 30 Comfortable With Instr.	.23**	.20	5.3	4.0	.32	.23
Item 34 Rating for Course						
by 21 Objectives Taught	.62****	.42**	38.4	17.6	.61	.40
by 22 Evaluation Reasonable	.40****	.42****	16.0	17.6	.36	.37
by 23 Diff. Level Too High	.19**	.23***	3.6	5.3	.25	.20
by 24 Accompaniment Stimul.	.52****	.38****	27.0	14.4	.52	.27
by 25 Approp. Work For Credit	.29**	.19	8.4	3.6	.29	.19
by 26 Class Size Too Large	.08	.28**	0.6	7.8	.09	.27

$P \leq$ *.05 **.01 ***.001 ****.0001

TABLE 1 (cont.)

Group	Pearson's r (1)	Pearson's r (2)	r^2 (1)	r^2 (2)	Spearman rho (1)	Spearman rho (2)
Item 35 Rating for Instructor						
by 10 Creative Teacher	.80****	.52****	64.0	27.0	.73	.55
by 11 Useful Feedback	.60****	.26****	36.0	6.8	.56	.27
by 12 Helpful/Understanding	.58****	.26***	33.6	6.8	.58	.25
by 13 Available for Consultation	.16	.04*	2.6	0.2	.18	.08
by 14 Demonstrates/Explains	.66****	.54****	43.6	29.2	.63	.45
by 15 Develops Good Pace	.59****	.50****	34.8	25.0	.54	.44
by 16 Outlines Objectives	.40****	.30***	16.0	9.0	.34	.28
by 17 Welcomes Questions	.38****	.20	14.4	4.0	.33	.23
by 18 Encourages Thinking	.30***	.39***	9.0	15.2	.29	.38
by 19 Positive Environment	.64****	.43****	41.0	18.5	.56	.49
by 20 Well Prepared	.80****	.50****	64.0	25.0	.68	.57

$P \leq$ *.05 **.01 ***.001 ****.0001

and item 31. Results indicated a negative or very low relationship between item 32 and item 4, hours of practice, item 5, required or elective status of the course, and item 6, reason the course was selected. Moderately low correlations of .20 (Group 1) and .31 (Group 2) supported at the .01 and .0001 level of significance respectively, were found between item 32 and item 7, expected grade, and correlations of .26 (Group 1) and .19 (Group 2) supported at the .0001 level were found between item 32 and item 31, appropriate prerequisites and technical skills for the course. Therefore, while the statistical results do not appear to be occurring by chance, the degree of relationship of these items with the level of technique is questionable.

The general or global assessment item 33, which asked for the students' rating of their effort in the course, was analyzed with items 27 through 30. Item 27, concerning the individual assistance and attention the student received which was necessary for development in technique, had little or no relationship with item 33 in either Group 1 or 2. The other correlations in this group are also low as can be seen by the fact that statements concerning the student's attitude (item 28), rate of improvement (item 29), and interaction with the instructor (item 30), had low but statistically significant correlations with item 33.

The largest difference noted between the data for Groups 1 and 2 was the range in correlations from .38 to .11

concerning item 28 on the students' attitude during the course. Probability levels for items 28 through 30 were significant at .01 to .0001 with the exception of item 30 in the the Group 2 data where the probability of random occurence was statistically higher.

Item 34, the overall rating for the course, was analyzed with items 21 through 26. Here one begins to see some greater item correlation with the global item. Items 21, teaching of course objectives, 22, reasonable methods used for evaluation, and 24, accompaniment for the course, had moderately strong and significant correlations in Groups 1 and 2 of .38 to .62. The remaining course items on level of difficulty (item 23), appropriate work for the credit (item 25), and size of the class (item 26), were not as highly correlated to the overall course rating with relationships that were low but positive, ranging from .08 to .29. With the exception of items 22, 23, and 24, the levels of significance varied greatly from Group 1 to Group 2.

The overall rating on instructor performance, item 35, was analyzed with specific instructor items 10 through 20; and, at this point the strength of the instructor subscale is most clearly seen. The comparison of item 35, with the statements concerning creativeness (item 19), effectively demonstrating and/or explaining (item 14), developing a good pace of instruction (item 15), creating a positive environment for learning (item 19), and being well prepared for class (item

20) were found to have high correlations ranging from .54 to .80 at the .0001 level of significance. Correlations of these same items within Group 2 were not as strong (.43 to .54) but were still significant at the .0001 level. Item 35 was also highly correlated with item 11, feedback on students' progress, and item 12, understanding and helpful to students, within Group 1. The relationship of these statements to item 35 was somewhat lower in the Group 2 data, however, significance levels remained acceptable from Group 1 to 2.

Instructor assessment statements concerning the outlining of objectives (item 16), welcoming questions and discussions (item 17), and encouraging students to think for themselves (item 18), had low to moderate correlations with item 35 of .20 to .40 within Groups 1 and 2. Levels of significance were fairly consistent at .001 to .0001 between groups on items 16 and 18, with item 17 varying from .0001 to .06. Availability for consultation with students, item 13, was found to have little or no relationship with item 35 in Group 1 or 2 with correlations of .16 to .04 of significance beyond the .05 level. Correlations as low as these, although not due to chance, do not reveal much in the way of relationships.

Scale Analysis: Internal Consistency

The instructor, course, and student (personal) assessment items were analyzed as separate scale units for a

measure of the internal consistency form of reliability. As noted in Table 2, analysis of instructor-related items from Group 1 indicates that scale means would not differ greatly if any of items 10 through 20 were deleted. Scale variance would remain high if items 13, availability for consultation, and 18, encourages students to think for themselves, were deleted and the internal consistency or reliability of the scale would be greater as shown by the rise in the alpha level above the scale coefficient of .8658. As indicated in the last column of figures in Table 2, the alpha level would increase to .8793 and .8703 if items 13 and 18, respectively, were deleted from the scale.

The comparison of the scale analysis of instructor-related items of Groups 1 and 2 indicates significantly less scale and item variance within the Group 2 data as is shown in Table 3. Consistent with the data from Group 1, the alpha level would increase if item 13 was deleted from the scale. Item 18, however, received higher correlations in relation to the other scale items in the Group 2 data and if deleted would not raise the degree of internal reliability of the scale.

The comparison of the scale analysis of course assessment items of Groups 1 and 2 were generally similar and appear on Tables 4 and 5, respectively. The mean of item variance was lower and the alpha level higher within the Group 1 data. With regard to Table 4, the scale variance would remain high and the consistency of the scale improve, if item

TABLE 2

SCALE ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTOR-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 1

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
144	20.0633	36.5187	6.0427	1.8240	0.7068	0.8658

Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Alpha if Deleted
10 Creative Teacher	1.9718	0.9144	0.7060	18.0916	28.2965	0.8386
11 Useful Feedback	2.2606	0.9652	0.0805	17.8028	29.2658	0.8513
12 Helpful/Understand.	1.7887	0.7703	0.0640	18.2747	30.5411	0.8498
13 Aval. For Consult.	1.5211	0.7964	0.0661	18.5423	34.2358	0.8793
14 Demon./Explains	1.7394	0.8726	0.0729	18.3239	29.0858	0.8432
15 Devel. Good Pace	2.0704	0.8476	0.0705	17.9930	29.9787	0.8495
16 Outlines Object.	1.6972	0.6841	0.0569	18.3662	32.3898	0.8604
17 Welcomes Questions	1.7606	0.7431	0.0617	18.3028	32.2835	0.8625
18 Encourages Think.	1.5423	0.8045	0.0668	18.5211	32.8896	0.8703
19 Positive Environ.	1.8028	0.8011	0.0665	18.2606	30.0097	0.8470
20 Well Prepared	1.9085	0.9958	0.0829	18.1549	27.4226	0.8362

TABLE 3

SCALE ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTOR-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 2

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
96	15.7917	15.5140	3.9388	1.4356	0.4253	0.7683

Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Alpha if Deleted
10 Creative Teacher	1.2188	0.402	0.0440	14.5729	14.2683	0.7619
11 Useful Feedback	1.3750	0.5477	0.0569	14.4167	13.8877	0.7609
12 Helpful/Understand.	1.5000	0.7398	0.0772	14.2917	13.1140	0.7612
13 Aval. For Consult.	1.3542	0.7396	0.0730	14.4375	13.6592	0.7751
14 Demon./Explains	1.4271	0.7362	0.0784	14.3646	12.2341	0.7355
15 Devel. Good Pace	1.8021	0.7344	0.0743	13.9896	11.7788	0.7207
16 Outlines Object.	1.5000	0.7539	0.0745	14.2917	12.3983	0.7428
17 Welcomes Questions	1.3750	0.4867	0.0486	14.4167	13.5930	0.7481
18 Encourages Think.	1.5521	0.8062	0.0831	14.2396	12.7104	0.7590
19 Positive Environ.	1.4063	0.5347	0.0546	14.3854	13.1657	0.7405
20 Well Prepared	1.2813	0.5171	0.0514	14.5104	13.4946	0.7480

TABLE 4

SCALE ANALYSIS OF COURSE-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 1

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
144	11.7958	7.0147	2.6485	1.9660	0.7657	0.4141

Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Scale Alpha if Deleted
21 Object. Taught	2.0352	0.9851	0.0821	9.7606	4.8217	0.3106
22 Eval. Reasonable	1.7606	0.9065	0.0752	10.0352	5.1832	0.3403
23 Diff. Lev. Too High	1.6268	0.6905	0.0574	10.1690	6.4961	0.4578
24 Accomp. Stimul.	2.2113	0.9515	0.0788	9.5845	4.9964	0.3272
25 Approp. Work/Credit	1.9789	0.7942	0.0661	9.8169	5.1435	0.2869
26 Class Size Too Lge	2.1831	0.8882	0.0740	9.6127	6.0120	0.4589

TABLE 5

SCALE ANALYSIS OF COURSE-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 2

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
99	10.3333	8.0140	2.8309	1.7222	0.5840	0.6754

Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Alpha if Deleted
21 Object. Taught	1.5000	0.6959	0.0694	8.8333	5.6772	0.5852
22 Eval. Reasonable	1.5208	0.5979	0.5985	8.8125	6.1750	0.6131
23 Diff. Lev. Too High	1.8229	0.7947	0.8294	8.5104	6.0631	0.6578
24 Accomp. Stimul.	1.6042	0.7878	0.7840	8.7292	5.6522	0.6124
25 Approp. Work/Credit	1.8958	0.8141	0.0838	8.4375	5.7645	0.6339
26 Class Size Too Lge	1.9896	0.8644	0.0890	8.3438	6.2280	0.6968

23, level of difficulty for the course and item 26, size of the class, were deleted. The consistency of the scale in Group 2 would also increase only if item 26 were deleted.

The comparison of the scale analysis of student (personal) assessment items of Groups 1 and 2 were extremely similar as shown on Tables 6 and 7, respectively. As with the instructor and course scales, the scale means would not differ greatly if any of the individual assessment items were deleted. The alpha levels of both groups would increase with the deletion of item 31, appropriate prerequisites and skills for the course.

In conclusion, the instructor assessment items of Groups 1 and 2 demonstrated the highest level of consistency as a scale with an alpha level of .8171. The student or personal scale followed with an alpha of .6084 and the scale analysis of the course items showed a reasonable average of .5447. Based on these figures, this evaluation instrument had a moderately high level of internal consistency or reliability when applied to the respondent sample.

Pretest and Posttest: Reliability

The stability form of reliability for the instrument was measured by the pretest and posttest method. The students within Group 1 were asked to complete the evaluation form a second time with 68 out of the initial 144 choosing to do so.

TABLE 6

SCALE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 1

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
144	10.1338	6.1593	2.4818	2.0268	0.6406	0.6000

Item Statistics

Items	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Alpha if Deleted
27 Assist. With Tech	2.4366	0.8461	0.0716	7.6972	4.1559	0.5354
28 Positive Attitude	1.7465	0.7189	0.0597	8.3873	4.2674	0.4941
29 Improve. Encourag.	2.2958	0.8975	0.0745	7.8380	3.7254	0.4753
30 Comfort. W/ Instr.	1.9507	0.6978	0.0581	8.1831	4.2499	0.4812
31 App. Skill/Prereq.	1.7199	0.8342	0.0700	7.7826	4.2395	0.6324

TABLE 7

SCALE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT-RELATED ITEMS FOR GROUP 2

Scale Statistics

N	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	Item Mean	Mean of Item Variance	Alpha
99	8.5938	6.4122	2.5322	1.7188	0.6494	0.6171

Item Statistics

Item	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance If Deleted	Alpha if Deleted
27 Assist. With Tech	1.9167	0.8543	0.0851	6.6771	4.0525	0.5052
28 Positive Attitude	1.5417	0.6793	0.0720	7.0521	4.8709	0.5709
29 Improve. Encourag.	1.8229	0.8078	0.0808	6.7708	4.4101	0.5490
30 Comfort. W/ Instr.	1.6458	0.6321	0.0633	6.9479	4.6815	0.5224
31 App. Skill/Prereq.	1.6667	1.0018	0.1022	6.9271	4.4683	0.6639

Referring to Table 8, the comparison of pretest and posttest responses to the global or general assessment items 32 through 35 indicated the instrument to be highly reliable with significance at the .0001 level and correlations of .81205 for item 32, students level of technique, .82772 for item 34 overall course rating, and .88069 for item 35, instructor's performance. The correlation for item 33, students' effort for the course was slightly lower at .64108 ($\underline{P} < .0001$).

Pretest and posttest responses were also correlated for the instructor scale (items 10 through 20), the course scale (items 21 through 26), and the student (personal) scale (items 27 through 26) as shown on Table 9. High coefficients of .89 and .82 ($\underline{P} < .0001$) were obtained between the pretest and posttest responses to the instructor and student scales. The course scale coefficient was lower at .68 ($\underline{P} < .0001$). The high degree of reliability obtained between the pretest and posttests may have been somewhat influenced by the short span of time between tests (memory retention) and the voluntary nature of the posttest procedure in which, perhaps, the more assured students elected to participate.

Faculty Self-Evaluation: Convergent Validity

Responses to the faculty self-evaluation form were compared with corresponding items from the students' evaluation of instructor and course for a measure of convergent validity.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST TEST GLOBAL ITEMS
FOR GROUP 1

n= 68		Mean	Std Dev	Sum
Item 32 Level of Technique	Pre	2.4030	0.7190	161.00
	Post	2.5932	0.6726	153.00
Item 33 Effort for Course	Pre	2.1970	0.8453	145.00
	Post	2.3220	0.9549	137.00
Item 34 Rating for Course	Pre	2.2090	1.0230	148.00
	Post	2.3167	1.0495	139.00
Item 35 Rating for Instructor	Pre	2.0896	1.0834	140.00
	Post	2.0833	1.0782	125.00

Correlation Matrix

		Post			
		Item 32	Item 33	Item 34	Item 35
Pre	Item 32	0.81205 0.0001	-0.10452 0.4308	0.02514 0.8488	0.02070 0.8752
	Item 33	0.10322 0.4407	0.64108 0.0001	0.37757 0.0032	0.32367 0.0124
	Item 34	-0.14250 0.2816	0.45265 0.0003	0.82772 0.0001	0.80520 0.0001
	Item 35	-0.08289 0.5325	0.39720 0.0018	0.84066 0.0001	0.88069 0.0001

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST TEST SCALE ITEMS
FOR GROUP 1

n= 68		Mean	Std Dev	Sum
Instructor Scale (Items 10-20)	Pre	1.8297	0.4783	109.78
	Post	1.7810	0.4608	119.33
Course Scale (Items 21-26)	Pre	2.0028	0.3972	120.17
	Post	1.9604	0.3839	131.35
Student Scale (Items 27-31)	Pre	2.0450	0.4587	122.70
	Post	2.0127	0.5168	134.85

		Post		
		Instructor	Course	Student
Pre	Instructor	0.88785 0.0001	0.65044 0.0001	0.72134 0.0001
	Course	0.60969 0.0001	0.67782 0.0001	0.52526 0.0001
	Student	0.63086 0.0001	0.47670 0.0001	0.82456 0.0001

An interval span between each of the five categories of the agree-disagree scale constituted a one-point difference in response in the comparison of the faculty to the student forms. The number of interval spans or point differences in response totaled 78 in the comparison of the two forms.

General information items 3, 4, and 5 on the faculty self-evaluation form corresponded to items 8, 9, and 41 on the student evaluation form. On these items information was requested pertaining to interest levels in the course before and after the semester and the percentage of students who would enroll in another dance course or recommend the course to others. A maximum 11-point difference in response was possible in the comparison of the above items.

Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 on the faculty self-evaluation form were matched to general assessment items 33, effort in the course, 32, student technique level, 35, rating of instructor performance, and 34, rating of the course, respectively, on the student evaluation form. A maximum 16-point difference in response was possible for this section.

Items 10 through 20 on the faculty form corresponded to items 10 through 20 on the student evaluation form. These items were specific to instructor assessment and a maximum 33-point difference in response could be accumulated. Similarly, course assessment items 21 through 26 on the faculty form corresponded to items 21 through 26 on the

student evaluation form. An 18-point difference in response was possible in this section.

The overall difference in response between the faculty self-ratings and student evaluations of faculty in Group 1 ranged from 8 to 35 points. More specifically, responses differed from 1 to 5 points in the information section, 0 to 8 points in the general assessment section, 2 to 16 points in the instructor assessment section, and 3 to 7 points in the course assessment section. The overall difference in faculty and student response for Group 2 ranged from 7 to 11 points with 1 to 2 points for the general information section, 1 to 2 points for the general assessment section, 2 to 5 points for the instructor assessment section, and 2 to 4 points for the course assessment section.

With regard to Group 1, there was an average 79% agreement between the faculty and student forms. With the exception of Courses E and F, the percentage of agreement within the individual courses was 76% or above. The instructors' self-evaluation in Courses E and F differed greatly from the students' response to the general assessment items and the specific instructor questions. The overall percentage of agreement was 55% in Course E and 65% in Course F. Personal observations by the researcher would tend to agree with the students in their evaluation of Courses E and F.

The item in the information section which received the most frequent and greatest discrepancy in points was that con-

cerning the percentage of students who planned on enrolling in another dance course or recommending the course to others. The faculty often predicted a lower percentage range in comparison to the number of students answering affirmatively to this question.

The general assessment or global item on "overall instructor performance" was most frequently rated at a higher scale point value by the faculty (one being the highest value) and acquired the largest point difference of the items in this section. The faculty also systematically rated the course and the students' level of technique more favorably than the students. The students and faculty agreed most often on the overall rating of the students' effort in the course with the faculty usually assigning a stronger scale value than that of the students when a discrepancy occurred.

The items in the instructor assessment section (10 through 20) on which the students and faculty most often differed (each group responding within one scale point value of each other) were those related to the instructor being helpful and understanding to students experiencing difficulty (item 12) and encouraging students to think for themselves (item 18). Items in which the faculty consistently rated themselves more favorably than the value assigned by the students were those concerning the instructor's creativeness (item 10), providing useful feedback on the student's progress (item 11), developing a good pace of instruction (item 15), and providing

verbally or by written outline the course objectives (item 16).

Within the section on course assessment, the items most frequently assigned a different scale value by the students and the faculty were those concerning the agreement between announced course objectives and what was actually taught (item 21), the accompaniment for the course (item 24), and the amount of work required for the credit received (item 25). The faculty affirmed more strongly than the students that there was considerable agreement between the announced objectives and the course structure. Interestingly, a majority of the faculty felt that the difficulty level of the course was too high more frequently and to a greater degree than the students did. The faculty also consistently marked the response of disagree to the question that the accompaniment was stimulating and interesting, whereas the students felt otherwise. Although the students and the faculty both agreed that the amount of work required was appropriate for the credit received, the faculty usually asserted this more strongly than the students.

There was an average agreement of 88% between the faculty self-ratings and student evaluations in Group 2. Similar to the findings for Group 1, the item in the information section concerning predicted enrollment in another dance class was responded to conservatively by the faculty in comparison to the number of students who marked yes to the question.

General assessment item 35, the overall performance of the instructor, was again the question which received the highest discrepancy in response by the faculty and students. In comparison to Group 1, however, the faculty rating of Group 2 was consistently lower in scale value (less favorable) than that of the students.

The students and faculty of Group 2 in spring semester responded more similarly in their ratings of the instructor assessment items than did Group 1 of fall semester. The consensus of feeling toward a majority of the items were the same but the students usually responded in the direction of a stronger rating than the faculty. Item 20, the instructor being well prepared for class, received the greatest difference in scale point response between faculty and students.

With regard to the course assessment section, faculty and student response was much the same from Group 1 to 2 concerning item 24, course accompaniment. The faculty consistently rated this item at a lower scale value than the students. Item 26 received the largest difference in scale points as a majority of the faculty strongly agreed that class size presented a hindrance to learning and the students responded otherwise.

In conclusion, the comparison of the faculty self--ratings and student evaluations in Group 2 were closer, and thus in greater agreement, than those of Group 1. Based on the analysis of information from items 1 and 2 on the faculty

self-evaluation form and from the overall comparison of faculty to student response, the faculty with the higher rank or position, with teaching experience in the range of 9 to 15 years, received higher student evaluations and were in greater agreement with the students' evaluation of their instruction and rating of the course.

Written Comments By Faculty and Students

Several of the instructors in Groups 1 and 2 chose to write comments in the space provided on the faculty self-evaluation form. Concerns or statements related to their instruction or the course provided additional or clarifying information which was helpful in understanding the difference between their own responses and those of the students on certain items. Some examples of the comments included concerns related to teaching schedule (e.g., time of day class was taught and number of classes in succession) and situations of a personal or professional nature which interfered with class instruction.

Students were encouraged to write comments in response to items 41 through 44 and mark the yes or no category on the answer sheet. Of the students in Group 1, 55% elected to write comments on the evaluation form along with 48% in Group 2. All of the items received a fair number of comments; however, it was difficult to determine the consensus of reply or a general

feeling from the wide variety and nonspecificity of the remarks, especially to items 41, 42, and 43.

Item 41, which inquired if the student would enroll in another dance course and/or recommend dance courses to others, received an affirmative reply from an average of 80% of the students in both groups. Even in those courses in which the students had rated the instructor and/or the course fairly low, the "yes" response to this item was still marked by a majority of the students.

Item 42, which asked the students if they were satisfied with the course, was often misinterpreted to mean satisfaction with the expected grade in the course. The question was evidently not clear as it was intended to tap satisfaction with the movement skills and other learning experiences. Item 43, which asked the students if they considered the course a valuable experience, did not elicit a great deal of practical information other than statements on course objectives.

Item 44, which inquired if the instructor had helped to make movement a pleasurable experience for the student, received the largest number of written comments. Many of the comments were functional in the diagnosis of specific strengths and weaknesses of the instructor and useful in their affirmation of responses made earlier on the instructor assessment items.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research has been to study the use of student evaluations of teacher and course effectiveness in dance technique classes at those colleges and universities in the southeast region of the United States which offer a program in dance. Dance educators at the selected schools were asked to complete a biographical profile sheet for background information and a questionnaire on the use of evaluations within their setting. Fifty percent of the southeast schools were polled; a 41% return rate from these was achieved.

The results from the questionnaires and evaluation forms submitted by the dance faculty were used in the development of new instrumentation. Validated forms from other institutions and a review of related literature on the validity, reliability, and construction of rating instruments were also very helpful.

The Schubert instrument was developed to evaluate instructor and course effectiveness specific to dance technique courses. Along with the questions concerning the instructor and course, items for the students self-assessment of attitude, effort, technique level, and skill improvement were included. A supplementary section for optional questions to be added by the instructor provided the opportunity for feedback on specific

methods of instruction and possible learning outcomes experienced by the students. Space for written comments in response to questions concerning the course and instructor was also included in the instrument.

An effort was made to select or develope items which would provide specific feedback on the dance environment, the instructor's performance, the course, and the student. Other factors taken into consideration in the development of the instrument were to keep the form as brief as possible, to make the statements clear and understandable, and to provide a form suitable for the needs of the faculty participants.

The Schubert evaluation form was tested in 12 dance courses of various levels and styles over the period of two semesters. The test-retest method was used to collect data on the reliability of the form in eight dance classes during the first semester. Pretests and posttests were administered one week apart and responses to the specific assessment items (instructor, course, and student scales) were compared along with the responses to the general assessment items. Correlations between the two administrations of the scales ranged from .68 to .89 and the global items from .64 to .88. The instructor scale items 10-20 (r=.89) and general assessment item 35, overall instructor performance, (r=88) were found to have the highest degree of reliability.

Results of the faculty self-evaluation form, completed by the instructor of each course tested, were compared to the

responses of the student evaluations to obtain a measure of convergent validity. There was an average 79% agreement between the faculty and student ratings in Group 1, fall semester, and an 88% agreement in Group 2, spring semester.

An analysis of the general assessment items with the corresponding specific assessment items provided a measure of the instrument's content validity, and the internal consistency was measured by a scale analysis of instructor-related items 10-20, course-related items 21-26, and student-related items 27-31. The results of these analyses indicated that the deletion of 6 out of 26 items would increase the validity level of the instrument. Overall, the instructor-related items were found to be the most internally reliable (alpha = .87 and .77 for Groups 1 and 2, respectively) followed by the student (personal) (alpha = .60 and .62) and course scales (alpha = .41 and .68).

Conclusion

From the many findings of the research, described as follows, the overall conclusion is drawn: the Schubert Evaluation Instrument of Instructor and Course in Dance Technique Classes was found to be valid, reliable, and feasible for use in varying styles and levels of technique. This study is notable in its attempt to explore the use of student evaluation forms in dance technique courses and in the development of new instrumentation.

Discussion

The dance educators' responses to an original questionnaire on the use of student evaluations were most helpful and practical for use in the development of new instrumentation. However, a larger return in the number of faculty members willing to participate was expected and would have strengthened and broadened the base of information from the questionnaire. The selection of 75%, rather than 50%, of the institutions from each state in the southeast region and the use of a follow-up letter to encourage participation may have increased the number of respondents.

The biographical profile sheet proved adequate in the collection of information on the dance faculty's educational background and teaching experience, but the form neglected to inquire about any dance training (acquisition of technique) which may have occurred outside the educational environment of a college or university. This information might have been helpful in the interpretation of dance faculty responses to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire about the use of student evaluations in dance technique courses was designed to examine the questions posed within the statement of the problem for this study. Based on the results of the questionnaire and the subsequent

development and testing of new instrumentation, a discussion of the findings is as follows:

1. Have university dance faculty evaluated dance technique courses by the use of student evaluations?

Dance faculty have and currently do use student evaluation in technique courses. Educators who are not currently administering evaluations in their courses most commonly state that no appropriate form is available.

2. What were the content and structure of the forms in use; the method and circumstances under which they were administered; and the processing techniques for the data?

An analysis of the submitted evaluation forms indicated that the majority contained questions to assess specific characteristics of the instructor and course, used general or global items for overall assessment, and included space for written comments related to the instructor and course. The forms were structured primarily for a lecture setting and contained few items for self-assessment by the student. A standardized form used campus wide was most often administered each semester or quarter that a technique course was offered. The evaluation forms were generally administered by the instructor of the course and collected by another individual. The instructor usually left the area while the students completed the evaluation. Computer processing of the data was used in a majority of the settings.

3. What were the major purposes of the evaluation form?

The major purposes of the form were to provide feedback for improvement of the instructor and the course and to allow for the expression of student concerns in the form of written comments.

4. How were the data used from the evaluation forms?

The results were primarily used for feedback to the instructor and administratively for decisions on tenure, promotion, and salary increases.

5. Were the forms thought to be satisfactory for the purposes intended?

A majority of the dance educators completing the questionnaire stated that the forms they had or were currently using were not satisfactory. Reasons for this response are explained in the answers to the following questions.

6. Were there any particular problems with the forms in use?

The problems or concerns which were stated expressed the need for a form specific to the dance activity setting and for one that would identify student learning outcomes and provide adequate space for written comments.

7. To what extent could a common instrument be developed which would be valid, reliable, feasible, practical, and generalizable within the instructional setting of dance technique courses which might offer options or modifications for use within varying skill levels, styles (ballet, modern, or jazz), and classes for dance majors or other students?

Results of the statistical analysis indicated that the Schubert Evaluation of Instructor and Course for Dance Technique Classes was a valid, reliable, and feasible instrument for use in varying styles and levels of technique within classes for dance majors or other students. The form was practical in terms of the printing and processing costs when used with an answer sheet suitable for optical scanning.

Based on the results of the statistical tests, the following changes are suggested for improvement of the instrument's effectiveness and degree of validity:

(1) The deletion of items 1-6 in the general information section concerning student classification, gender, grade point average, hours of practice outside of class, and reason for selecting the course as they are no longer necessary for the purpose of validation.

(2) The deletion of items 13, availability for consultation; 26, class size too large; 41, enroll again or recommend another dance course; and 43, course a valuable experience, because of their ineffectiveness to adequately assess the instructor and/or the course.

(3) Additional testing of items 18, encourages students to think for themselves; 23, difficulty level of course; 25, appropriate work for the credit; and 30, comfortable with instructor, to determine if these items significantly increase the validity of the instrument.

(4) The rephrasing and relocation of items 27, assistance with technique, and 31, appropriate skills and prerequisites, to determine if these questions could be applied more effectively elsewhere in the instrument.

(5) The deletion of the "yes or no" responses to the questions in the written comment section and the restructuring of item 42, satisfaction with the course, for a clearer definition of the statement.

(6) The use of some or all of the supplementary (optional) instructor items as open ended or cue-structured statements in the written comment section.

Recommendations

The Schubert instrument, although designed for the more open and changing environment of the dance setting, can be adapted for use within other activity structured courses. The feelings and attitudes of the students concerning the learning of techniques and skills applies not only to the medium of dance but to areas such as the fine and visual arts, home economics, and architecture. Since those are fields of study which utilize movement for the teaching of concepts or skills, they might find this evaluation instrument useful especially where instructional pace and presentation vary in response to student learning.

It is recommended that the Schubert instrument be adapted for use in other educational settings where movement skills are taught. Testing of the instrument to determine the effectiveness of the previously discussed modifications is also suggested along with the use of concurrent peer evaluation as an additional method of obtaining information on the degree of convergent validity. Lastly, it is recommended that the evaluation form be administered in a different geographical section of the United States to provide additional data on the instrument's generalizability to a larger population.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, A. & Lee, C. B. (1976). Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C. B. Lee (Ed.), Improving College Teaching. Washington, DC American council on Education.

Ahmadi, G. (1981). A study of student opinions toward faculty evaluation by students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.

Aleamoni, L. M. & Spencer, R. E. (1973). The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A description of its development and a report of some of its results. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33, 669-684.

Aleamoni, L. M. & Yimer, M. (1973). An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research, productivity, and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64 (3), 274-277.

Balducci, M. S. (1978). Profile rating tables for reviewing faculty in physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

Barke, C. R., Tollefson, N. & Tracy, D. B. (1983). Relationship between course entry attitudes and end-of-course ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75 (1), 75-85.

Batista, E. & Brandenburg, D. (1978). The instructor self-evaluation form: development and validation of an ipsative forced-choice measure of self-perceived faculty performence. Research in Higher Education, 9, 319-332.

Bausell, R. B. & Magoon, J. (1972). Expected grade in a course, grade point average, and student ratings of the course and the instructor. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 32, 1013-1023.

Bayer, A. E. & Dutton, J. (1979). Trends in attitudes on political, social, and collegiate issues among college

students: the mid-1960's to mid-1970's. Journal of Higher Education, 47, 159-171.

Bejar, I. I. (1975). A survey of selected administrative practices supporting student evaluation of instruction programs. Research in Higher Education, 3, 77-86.

Berk, R. A. (1979). The construction of rating instruments for faculty evaluation. Journal of Higher Education, 50 (5), 650-669.

Blackburn, R. T. & Clark, M. J. (1975). An assessment of faculty performance: some correlates between administrator, colleague, student, and self-ratings. Sociology of Education, 48, 242-256.

Blank, R. (1978). Faculty support for evaluation of teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (2), 163-176.

Bohrnstedt, G. & Campbell, R. T. (1972). An item analysis package for likert scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 32, 181-183.

Bookhout, E. (1967). Teaching behavior in relation to the social-emotional climate of physical education classes. The Research Quarterly, 38 (3), 336-347.

Boyar, S. (1979). The relationship between student evaluations, rationale for course selection, and expected course grade. College Student Journal, 13 (2), 195-199.

Bresler, J. B. (1968). Teaching effectiveness and government awards. Science, 160, 164-167.

Bridger, J. A. (1973). Teacher evaluation with a computerized student opinionaire. Improving College and University Teaching, 21 (1), 43-45.

Bromley, A., Johnston, D. & Sledjeski, S. (1973). Evaluation is vital and integral. Improving College and University Teaching, 21 (1), 49-50.

Brown, F. D. (1978). A survey of the perceptions of a selected group of university students concerning student evaluation of instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Carrier, N. A., Howard, G. S., and Miller, W. G. (1974). Course evaluation: when? Journal of Educational Psychology, 66 (4), 609-613.

Carter, E. H. (1976) The use of summated ratings in faculty evaluation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,

Centra, J. A. (1972). Evaluating college teaching: the rhetoric and the research. Current Issues in Higher Education, 27, 225-233.

Centra, J. A. (1973). Self-ratings of college teachers: a comparison with student ratings. Journal of Educational Measurement, 10, 287-295.

Centra, J. A. (1974). The relationship between student and alumni ratings of teachers. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 34 (2), 321-326.

Centra, J. A. (1977). Student ratings of instruction and their relationships to student learning. American Educational Research Journal, 14 (1), 17-24.

Centra, J. A. (1980). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Centra, J. A. & Creech, F. R. (1977). The relationship between student, teacher, and course characteristics and student ratings of teacher effectiveness. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Clair, M. & Snyder, C. R. (1979). Effects of instructor-delivered sequential evaluative feedback upon students' subsequent classroon-related performance and instructor ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71 (1), 50-57.

Cohen, A. M., Trent. J. W., & Rose, C. (1973). Evaluation of teaching. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicag: Rand McNally and Company.

Coleman, J. & McKeachie, W. J. (1981). Effects of instructor/course evaluations on student course selection. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73 (2), 224-226.

Colvin, W. & Roundy, E. (1976). An instrument for the student evaluation of teaching effectiveness in physical education activity courses. The Research Quarterly, 47 (2), 296-299.

Cordes, C. F. (1982). Teaching effectiveness: an analysis of faculty opinion and student ratings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School,

Costin, F., Greenough, W. T. & Menges, R. (1971). Student ratings of college teaching: reliability, validity, and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 4 (5), 511-535.

Crawford, P. L. & Bradshaw, H. (1968). Perception of characteristics of effective university teachers: a scaling analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 28, 1079-1085.

Crittenden, K., Norr, J., & LeBailly, R. (1975). Size of university classes and student evaluations of teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 46 (4), 461-470.

Crowe, M. H. (1974). Selected student characteristics and their relationship to course ratings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University,

Curry, J. (1976). Students - generally lack the critical ability necessary for faculty evaluation. College Student Journal, 10 (4), 306-311.

Delaney, E. L. (1977). The influence of teaching experience and instructional development activities on student

ratings of instruction obtained by beginning professors at a large university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University,

Derry, J. O. (1979). Can students' ratings of instruction serve rival purposes? Journal of Higher Education, 50 (1), 79-88.

Downie, N. W. (1952). Student evaluation of faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 23, 495-496 & 503.

Doyle, K. O. & Wattawa, S.. (1977). Programs for the construction and analysis of custom questionnaires and rating scales. Educational and Psychologial Measurement, 37, 237-239.

Driscoll, L. A. (1977). The effects of different instructions on students' evaluations of faculty and courses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Elmore, P. & Pohlmann, J. (1978). Effect of teacher, student and class characteristics on the evaluation of college instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70 (2), 187-192.

Feldhusen, J., Bodine, R., & Crowe, M. (1976). A model of instruction as the base for course and instructor evaluation. College Student Journal, 10 (3), 197-203.

Feldhusen, J. & Mazzuca, S.. (1979). Effects of situations and performance variables on instructional ratings. College Student Journal, 13 (1), 2-4.

Feldman, K. (1977). Consistency and variability among college students in rating their teachers and courses: a review and analysis. Research in Higher Education, 6, 223-274.

Feldman, R. S. & Theiss, A. J. (1982). The teacher and student as pygmalions: joint effects of teacher and student expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74 (2), 217-223.

Fenker, R. M. (1975). The evaluation of university faculty and administrations: a case study. Journal of Higher Education, 46 (6), 665-686.

Finkbeiner, C. T., Lathrop, J. S., & Schuerger, J. M. (1971). Course and instructor evaluation: some dimensions of a questionnaire. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64 (2), 159-163.

Finn, R. H. (1972). Effects of some variations in rating scale characteristics on the means and reliabilities of ratings. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 32, 255-265.

First, R.. (1978). Systematic variance in faculty evaluations caused by student characteristics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University,

Foster, D. & Alderman, K. (1974). A student-centered course evaluation form. College Student Journal, 8 (1), 55-57.

Fowler, E. & McKenzie, G. (1975). Instructor evaluation based on student perceptions of achievement. College Student Journal, 9 (3), 217-224.

French, G. M. (1957). College students' concept of effective teaching determined by an analysis of teacher ratings. Dissertation Abstracts International, 17, 1380-1381.

Frey, P. W. (1976). Validity of student instructional ratings: does timing matter? Journal of Higher Education, 47 (3), 327-336.

Frey, W., Leonard, D., & Beatty. W. (1975). Student ratings of instruction: validation research. American Educational Research Journal, 12 (4), 435-447.

Froman, R. (1976). The influences of format change on the halo effect of student ratings. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco.

Gadzella, B. (1968). College students' views and ratings of an ideal professor. College and University, 44, 89-96.

Gaff, J. & Wilson, R. (1971). The teaching environment. AAUP Bulletin, 57 (4), 475-493.

Gage, N. L. (1961). The appraisal of college teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 32, 17-22.

Gage, N. L. (1972). Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Evaluation. Palo Alto: Pacific Books.

Gage, N. L. (1974). Students' ratings of college teaching: their justification and proper use. In N. S. Glasman and B. R. Killait (Eds.), Second UCSB Conference on Effective Teaching. Santa Barbara: University of California.

Garrison, C. S. (1977). Effects of classification, sex and grade point average on student evaluation of physical education instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia,

Giordano, G. (1978). Student evaluation of teaching - a sword with two edges. College Student Journal, 12 (4), 354-355.

Glassman, N. S. & Killait, B. R. (Eds.), (1974). Second USCB conference on effective teaching. Santa Barbara: University of California,

Gmelch, W. H. (1975). Student evaluation of college instructors: toward the classification and implementation of its purposes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Santa Barbara.

Gmelch, W. & Glassman, N. (1978). Student perceptions of their qualifications to evaluate college teaching. College Student Journal, 12 (4), 398-411.

Granzin, K. L. & Painter, J. J. (1973). A new explanation for students' course evaluation tendencies. American Educational Research Journal, 10 (2), 115-124.

Guthrie, E. R. (1954). The evaluation of teaching: a progress report. Seattle: University of Washington.

Hansen, B. (1976). Teacher evaluation is immoral. Community College Review, 4 (3), 4-7.

Hartley, E. & Hogan, T. (1972). Some additional factors in student evaluation of courses. American Educational Research Journal, 9 (2), 241-250.

Haslett, B. J. (1976). Student knowledgeability, student sex, class size, and class level: their interactions and influences on student ratings of instruction. Research in Higher Education, 5, 39-65.

Hayes, J. R. (1971). Research, teaching, and faculty fate. Science, 172, 227-230.

Hocking, J. (1976). College students' evaluations of faculty are directly related to course interest and grade expectation. College Student Journal, 10 (4), 312-316.

Howard, G. & Bray, J. (1979). Use of norm groups to adjust student ratings of instruction: a warning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71 (1), 58-63.

Holmes, D. S. (1971). The teaching assessment blank: a form for the student assessment of college instructors. The Journal of Experimental Education, 39 (3), 34-38.

Kapel, D. E. (1974). Assessment of a conceptually based instructor evaluation form. Research in Higher Education, 2, 1-24.

Kiernan, I. (1975). Student evaluations re-evaluated. Community and Junior College Journal, 45, 25-27.

Kohlan, R. G. (1973). A comparison of faculty evaluations early and late in the course. Journal of Higher Education, 44, 587-595.

Kohr, R.L. (1971). An item analysis and scoring program for summated rating scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 31, 769-770.

Korth, B. (1979). Relationship of extraneous variables to student ratings of instruction. Journal of Educational Measurement, 16 (1), 27-37.

Kronk, A. & Shipka, T. (1980). Evaluation of faculty in higher education. Washington DC: National Education Association.

Lasher, H. & Vogt, K. (1974). Student evaluation: myths and realities. Improving College and University Teaching, 22 (4), 267-269.

Leventhal, L., Abrami, P., & Perry, R. (1976). Do teacher rating forms reveal as much about students as about teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 68 (4), 441-445.

Lolli, A., Owen, S., & Froman, R. (1975). Student ratings: further explorations in validity. Paper presented at Northeastern Educational Research Assoc. Ellenville, New York.

Magoon, J. & Bausell, B. (1973). Required versus elective course ratings. College Student Journal, 7 (1), 29-33.

Marsh, H. W., Fleiner, H. & Thomas, C. S. (1975). Validity and usefulness of student evaluations of instructional quality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 67 (6), 833-839.

Marsh, H., Kesler, S., & Overall, J. (1979). Validity of student evaluations of instructional effectiveness: a comparison of faculty self-evaluations and evaluations by their students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71 (2), 149-160.

Maslow, A. H. & Zimmerman, W. (1956). College teaching ability, scholarly activity, and personality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 47, 185-189.

Masters, J. R. (1974). The relationship between number of response categories and reliability of likert-type questionnaires. Journal of Educational Measurement, 11 (1), 49-53.

Maull, C. A. (1979). An analysis of the relationship between faculty member self-esteem level and attitudes toward student evaluations of teaching performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

McGrath, E. J. (1962). Characteristics of outstanding college teachers. Journal of Higher Education, 33, 148.

McKeachie, W. J. (1968). Student ratings of faculty. AAUP Bulletin, 55, 439-444.

McKeachie, W. J. Lin, Y., & Mann, W. (1971). Student ratings of teacher effectiveness: validity studies. American Educational Research Journal, 8 (3), 435-445.

McNeil, J. & Popham, W. (1973). The assessment of teacher competence. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Meyer, D. & Smith, C. (1977). A nationwide survey of teacher education faculty evaluation practices. College Student Journal, 11 (1), 1-9.

Miller, B. J. (1979). Differences in teaching styles between college disciplines on student evaluations of instruction when low-inference items are used and halo effect is controlled. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.

Mintzes, J.(1979). Academic self-concept and student ratings of instructors. College Student Journal, 13 (2), 167-173.

Montenegro, X. (1978). Ideal and actual student perceptions of college instructors as predictors of teacher

effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Morrow, J. (1976). The effects of response position and item simplicity on the factoral structure of teacher evaluation forms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Morrow, J. (1977). Some statistics regarding the reliability and validity of student ratings of teachers. The Research Quarterly, 48 (2), 372-375.

Oles, H. J.(1975). The validity of student evaluations of instructors and their courses with implications for validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 35, 437-445.

Ory, J., Brandenburg, D., & Peiper, D. (1980). Selection of course evaluation items by high and low rated faculty of varying academic rank. Research in Higher Education, 12 (3), 245-253.

Overall, J. (1977). Students' evaluation of instructional effectiveness: validity and utility. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Overall, J. & Marsh, H. (1980). Students' evaluations of instruction: a longitudinal study of their stability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72 (3), 321-325.

Palmer, J., Carliner, G., & Romer, T. (1978). Leniency, learning, and evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70 (5), 855-863.

Painter, J. & Granzin, K. (1972). Consistency theory as an explanation of students' course evaluation tendencies. The Journal of Experimental Education, 41 (1), 78-81.

Parker, G. (1980). Effects of expected grade and student and instructor gender on student ratings of teaching effectiveness at a selected California state university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Penfield, D. (1978). Student ratings of college teaching: rating the utility of rating forms. Journal of Educational Research, 72 (1), 19-22.

Perry, R., Abrami, P., & Leventhal, L. (1979). Educational seduction: the effect of instructor expressiveness and lecture content on student ratings and achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71 (1), 107-116.

Purohit, A. & Magoon, J. (1974). Congruence in attitude of instructors and students towards course evaluations. College Student Journal, 8 (1), 29-36.

Rayder, N. (1967). College student ratings of instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Colorado State College.

Renner, R. (1967). A successful rating scale. Improving College and University Teaching, 15 (1), 12-14.

Riley, J. W., Ryan, B. F., & Lifschitz, M. (1950). The student looks at his teacher. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press.

Romney, D. (1976). Course effect vs. teacher effect on students' ratings of teaching competence. Research in Higher Education, 5, 345-350.

Ryan, J., Anderson, J., & Birchler, A. (1980). Student evaluation: the faculty responds. Research in Higher Education, 12 (4) 317-333.

Scheck, D. (1978). The use and abuse of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness in higher education. College Student Journal, 12 (3) Part 2, 1-12.

Schultz, C. B. (1978). Some limits to the validity and usefulness of student ratings of teachers: an argument for caution. Educational Research Journal, 3 (2), 12-27.

Schwab, D. P. (1975). Course and student characteristic correlates of the course evaluation instrument. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (6), 742-747.

Seldin, P. (1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs. New York: Coventry Press.

Sherman, T. & Winstead, J. (1975). A formative approach to student evaluation of instruction. Educational Technology, 15, 34-39.

Siegel, L. (1978). A data-based scheme for evaluating faculty performance. Research in Higher Education, 8, 255-271.

Solomon, D. (1966). Teacher behavior dimensions, course characteristics, and student evaluations of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 3, 35-47.

Spencer, R. & Aleamoni, L. (1970). A student course evaluation questionnaire. Journal of Educational Measurement, 7 (3), 209-210.

Stone, E., Rabinowitz, S., & Spool, M. (1977). Effect of anonymity on student evaluations of faculty performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69 (3), 274-280.

Stone, E. & Spool, M., & Rabinowitz, S. (1977). Effects of anonymity and retaliatory potential on student evaluation of faculty performance. Research in Higher Education, 6, 313-325.

Stumpf, S. & Freedman, R. (1979). Expected grade covariation with student ratings of instruction: individual versus class effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71 (3), 293-302.

Stumpf, S. Friedman, R., & Krieger, K. (1979). Validity extension of the course-faculty instrument (CFI). Research in Higher Education, 11 (1), 13-21.

Tetenbaum, T. (1977). The factor invariance of student ratings of instruction under three sets of directions. Research in Higher Education, 6, 11-23.

Torabi, H. (1979). A study of the effects of certain non-teaching factors on student ratings of instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University.

Touq, M. S. & Feldhusen, J. (1974). Validity of student ratings of instructors. College Student Journal, 8 (4), 2-5.

Walker, B. D. (1969). An investigation of selected variables relative to the manner in which a population of junior college students evaluate their teacher. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29 (9-B), 3474.

Whitely, S. & Doyle, K. (1976). Implicit theories in student ratings. American Educational Research Journal, 13 (4), 241-253.

Whitten, B. J. & Umble, M. (1980). The relationship of class size, class level, and core vs. none-core classification for a class to student ratings of faculty: implications for validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40 (2), 419-423.

Wilson, P. (1978) A comparison of two student instructional rating forms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Zakrajsek, D. & Bos, R. (1978). Student evaluations of teaching performance. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 49 (5), 64-65.

APPENDIX A:

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

As a doctoral student specializing in dance at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, I am conducting a dissertation research project. This study involves the collection of information regarding the current use of student evaluation forms for determination of teacher/course effectiveness in dance technique courses within higher education.

I have randomly selected the dance program at your institution as a representative of the geographical area chosen for this study. I am contacting you as a member of the dance faculty for help and assistance in the first and final stages of this study.

The first stage will involve the completion of a brief questionnaire pertaining to the use of student evaluation forms in your particular setting, a biographical profile sheet for background information on yourself as a participant, and the submission of a copy of the evaluation form(s) used in your dance technique course(s) (modern, ballet, jazz) if such a form is currently administered and available. The information received from this first stage of the research will be used in the second toward the development of a new evaluation form which will then be sent to all participants. In the last stage of this study, you will be asked to either complete a second questionnaire pertaining to the instrument's feasibility, validity, and appropriateness to your particular setting or to administer the new form to students in one of your dance technique courses to obtain results concerning reliability of the form.

A complete file of the student evaluation forms of teacher/course effectiveness used by the other respondents will be mailed to you upon request as a participating subject in this study and the evaluation instrument developed within this project will be available for your continued use. Other members of the dance faculty currently teaching dance technique within your program are also encouraged to participate and I would greatly appreciate your willingness to pass this information along to those who may be interested.

Needless to say, your input and assistance is vital to the success of this project and most necessary for the expansion of knowledge in an area that has yet to be investigated. Please be assured that all information received will remain confidential and anonymous and every effort will be made to keep correspondence brief in the realization that you are giving valuable time to participate.

I would appreciate a reply concerning your decision to participate via the enclosed response card by March 1, 1982. Thank you again for your time and consideration of this study.

Sincerely,

Deborah David Schubert
Former Faculty, Wake Forest Univ.
Presently, Adjunct Faculty, Univ. of Fla.

Address: 2837 N.W. 42nd Place
Gainesville, Fl.32605
Phone: 904/375-2008

Sarah M. Robinson, Ph.D.
Dissertation Advisor
Associate Professor, HPERD
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

APPENDIX B:

LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Your cooperation and willingness to carry through with the project is greatly appreciated.

A questionnaire on the use of student evaluation forms of teacher/course effectiveness is enclosed along with a biographical profile sheet for the purpose of obtaining professional information which may have some bearing on the final results of this study. Your signature is also requested on the "Informed Consent Form" printed on the back of the profile sheet. The submission of a copy of the evaluation form currently used within your dance technique course(s), if such a form is available, would be most appreciated and may be attached to the enclosed questionnaire.

Please notice that you have been assigned a code number, the purpose of which is to maintain your anonymity and confidentiality in all correspondence. It is hoped that you will be able to return the completed materials in the stamped return envelope by March 29, 1982 so the process of compilation of information can begin soon.

Again, thank you for your participation. If you have questions or I can be of assistance to you in any way, please contact me at the address or telephone number below.

Sincerely,

Deborah David Schubert

APPENDIX C:

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I understand that the purpose of this study is: To obtain information concerning the use of student evaluations of teacher/course effectiveness in dance technique courses.

I confirm that my participation is entirely voluntary. No coercion of any kind has been used to obtain my cooperation.

I understand that I may withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time during this project.

I have been informed of the procedures that will be used in the project and understand what will be required of me as a subject.

I understand that all of my responses will be anonymous and held in strict confidence.

I understand that a summary of the results of the project will be made available to me at the completion of the study if I so request.

I wish to give my voluntary consent for participation in this study.

_____
signature

_____
date

APPENDIX D:

BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILE SHEET

Code #_____

Date_____

Name_____ Female___ Male____
Last First MI Date of Birth__/__/___

Professional Rank and/or Title_____

Highest Earned Degree Date Rec'd Institution

_____ ___/___/____ _____

Please specify number of months/years of teaching experience you have had in the following academic settings and other dance related areas.

____public/private schools K-6 _____private studio
____public/private schools 7-12 _____two year college
____college/university _____dance company (prof.)
____community (Y's, arts council) _____other_____

Please designate your length of teaching experience (months/years) in the following forms and levels of dance technique along with the average enrollment of students in the technique courses you are presently teaching.

	Modern	Enr.	Ballet	Enr.	Jazz	Enr.
Beginning	_____	____	_____	____	____	____
Intermediate	_____	____	_____	____	____	____
Advanced	_____	____	_____	____	____	____

Does the instruction of dance technique courses comprise fifty percent or more of your present course load?

yes__ no__

Will you be teaching a dance technique course during the summer semester/quarter of 1982 in modern, ballet, or jazz?

yes__ no__ possibly__

APPENDIX E:

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USE OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHER/COURSE EFFECTIVENESS IN DANCE TECHNIQUE COURSES

Have student evaluations for determination of teacher/course effectiveness been administered in any or all of your dance technique courses this academic year?

yes____ no____

*If your answer is yes, please respond only to questions in Section A.

*If your answer is no, please respond only to questions in Section B.

SECTION A

***Check (#) all appropriate responses.

Are you required to evaluate your technique courses by the use of student evaluations?

yes____ no____

Are the student evaluations administered each semester/quarter the technique course is offered?

yes____ no____

If not, specify how often_____.

Please designate the type of evaluation form you currently use.

____Standardized form used campus wide.

____Standardized, specific to each department.

____Form constructed by individual department.

____Personally developed form of your own.

____Combination of the above.

____Other, specify_____.

Check all of the following statements which describe the circumstances under which your student evaluation form is administered.

____You administer and collect the evaluation yourself.

____You administer the evaluation and another individual collects the forms.

____Another individual administers the evaluation and collects the forms.

____You leave the room while the students complete the evaluation form.

____The students can obtain knowledge of their final course grade before the evaluation is administered.

If none of the above statements are descriptive of your circumstances please explain_____
_____.

Which of the following methods are used to process the data from your student evaluation forms?

____Computer processed.

____Tabulated by hand (statistical summary).

____Descriptive summary (non-statistical).

____Results not processed.

Please designate all individuals who have access to the results of the information obtained from the student evaluation forms.

____Chairperson/administrator of college or department in which dance resides.

____Dance chairperson/administrator.

____Faculty instructor of the course evaluated.

____Other faculty members within department/division.

____Students within the evaluated course.

____General campus population.

____Other, specify _____.

Do you have access to the results of the student evaluation forms before your final grades are submitted?

yes____ no____

Please designate the dance form(s) and level(s) of technique courses in which you have used student evaluations to determine teacher/course effectiveness.

	Modern	Ballet	Jazz	Other
Beginning	____	____	____	_____
Intermediate	____	____	____	_____
Advanced	____	____	____	_____

Please make responses in Column A to indicate the purpose(s) for which the data from student evaluations is/are used in your setting.

Please make responses in Column B to indicate the purpose(s) for which data from student evaluations should be used for.

	A	B
Tenure Assignment	____	____
Promotion	____	____
Appointment	____	____
Merit Pay	____	____
Salary Increases	____	____
Professional Leave	____	____
Teacher/Course Improvement	____	____
Other	____	____

Please designate which of the following statement(s) is/are descriptive of the evaluation form you currently use.

____Provides feedback on class environment.

____At least 80% of the form is completed by the students.

____Too brief in length.

____Appropriate for activity setting.

____Identifies student learning outcomes.

____Provides feedback for course improvement.

____Questions are clearly understood by students.

____Specific to the dance environment.

____Too long in length.

____Allows expression for student concerns.

____Structured primarily for lecture setting.

____Identifies student's self-concepts.

____Provides feedback for teacher improvement.

____Questions are stated fairly - unbiased in structure.

Is the student evaluation form currently used satisfactory for your intended purpose(s)?

yes____ no____

Do you feel the use of student evaluation forms has improved the quality of your teaching?

yes____ no____

What recommendations and/or suggestions do you have for a student evaluation form that would be appropriate to your specific setting and needs within the instructional environment of a dance technique course?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

**Please attach a copy of the student evaluation form used in your setting if such a form is available.

SECTION B

*** Check (#) all appropriate responses.

Has a student evaluation form for determination of teacher/course effectiveness ever been administered in any or all of your dance technique courses?

yes_____ no_____ If yes, when was the last approximate date of use?_____

If the above answer is yes, please designate the dance form(s) and level(s) in which the evaluation was administered.

	Modern	Ballet	Jazz	Other____ ____
Beginning	____	____	____	_____ _____
Intermediate	____	____	____	_____ _____
Advanced	____	____	____	_____ _____

Please designate the reason(s) why you do not currently evaluate your dance technique course(s) by the use of student evaluations.

____Not required by department/administrator.

____No appropriate form is available.

____Form is available but information from data is not useful.

____Other, specify_____.

What recommendations and/or suggestions do you have for a student evaluation form that would be appropriate to your specific setting and needs within the instructional environment of a dance technique course?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If a student evaluation form was developed appropriate to your specific needs and purpose, would you use it?

yes____ no____

If not, explain_____

_____.

** Please attach a copy of the student evaluation form you have previously used within your setting or possibly a current form used within your department if such a form is available.

APPENDIX F:

REFERENCE LISTING OF EVALUATION FORMS

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08541
(SIR) "Student Instructional Report"

Kansas State University
Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development
1623 Anderson Avenue
Manhattan, Kansas City 66502
IDEA Survey Form

Northwestern University
CRESAP Laboratory of Neuroscience and Behavior
2021 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201
"Endeavor Instructional Rating System"

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Instructional Evaluation
B-20 Woody Hall
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
ICE "Instructor and Course Evaluation Form"

University of Arizona
Office of Instructional Research and Development
1325 E. Speedway Blvd.
Tuscon, Arizona 85721
CIEQ "Arizone Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire"

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Measurement and Research Division
307 Engineering Hall
Urbana, Illinois 61806
ICES "Instructor and Course Evaluation System"

University of Iowa
Evaluation and Exam Service
300 Jefferson Bldg.
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

University of Michigan
Center of Research on Learning and Teaching
109 E. Madison Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
IDQ "Instructor Designed Questionnaire"

University of Washington
Educational Assessment Center PB-30
Seattle, Washington 98105
"Instructional Assessment System"

APPENDIX G:

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE
FOR DANCE TECHNIQUE CLASSES

Items 1-9: General Information
**Please write your student identification number and blacken the appropriate number on the answer sheet provided.

Blacken one response number for each question.

1. Classification: (1) Freshman
(2) Sophomore
(3) Junior
(4) Senior
(5) Graduate
(6) Non-degree

2. Sex: (1) Female
(2) Male

3. Cumulative Grade Pt. Average:

(1) 3.5-4.0
(2) 3.0-3.49
(3) 2.5-2.99
(4) 2.0-2.49
(5) 1.5-1.99
(6) 1.0-1.49
(7) less than 1.0
(8) none as yet

4. Hours of practice outside of class per/week:

(1) 0 hrs.
(2) 1
(3) 2
(4) 3 hrs.
(5) 4
(6) 5-over

5. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?

(1) major requirement
(2) minor requirement
(3) major elective
(4) minor elective
(5) general education requir.
(6) general elective
(7) other

6. Which one of the following was your most important reason for selecting this course:

(1) friends recommended course
(2) faculty advisor's recomm.
(3) instructor's reputation
(4) thought I could make a good grade
(5) Subject was one of interest
(6) needed the credit(s)
(7) fit into schedule
(8) could use Pass/Fail option

7. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
(1) A
(2) B
(3) C
(4) D
(5) Pass
(6) Fail
(7) Audit
(8) Other

8. Interest in subject before course:
(1) low (2) medium (3) high

9. Interest in subject after course:
(1) low (2) medium (3) high

*This questionnaire provides you the opportunity to express anonymously your views of this instructor and course. Please indicate the response closest to your view by blackening the appropriate number.

(0) Not Applicable or Don't Know
(1) Strongly Agree with statement
(2) Agree with statement
(3) Disagree with statement
(4) Strongly Disagree with statement

Items 10-20: The Instructor:

10. is a creative teacher.
11. provides useful feedback on my progress (identifying strengths and weaknessess).
12. is not understanding of and helpful to students who experience difficulty with the movement.
13. is available for consultation with students.
14. does not effectively demonstrate and/or explain when necessary.
15. develops a good pace of instruction in accordance with students ability.
16. provides verbally or via written outline the course objectives.
17. welcomes questions and discussions.
18. does not encourage students to think for themselves.
19. creates a positive environment for learning.
20. is well prepared for class.

Items 21-26: Course Assessment

21. There is considerable agreement between the announced course objectives and what is actually taught.
22. The methods used for evaluation of performance are reasonable.
23. The level of difficulty of this course is too high.
24. The accompaniment is stimulating and interesting.
25. The amount of work required is not appropriate for the credit received.
26. The size of the class (number of students) presents a hindrance to learning.

Items 27-31: Personal Assessment

27. I receive the individual assistance and attention necessary for development of my technique level.
28. I generally do not have a positive attitude during class.
29. I am encouraged by my rate of improvement.
30. I feel comfortable in my interactions with the instructor.
31. I did not have the appropriate prerequisites and technical skills for this course.

Items 32-35: General Assessment

32. My present level of technique compared with the other students in this course is:
33. My overall effort in this course compared to other activity or dance courses taken is:
34. Considering all of its' aspects, I would rate this course as:
35. I would rate the instructor's overall performance throughout the course as:

*Please use the following scale:

(0) Not applicable or Don't Know
(1) Excellent
(2) Very Good
(3) Satisfactory
(4) Poor
(5) Very Poor

Items 36-40: Supplementary Questions by Instructor

*If the instructor provides supplementary questions and response items, use this section for responding. Blacken one response for each question.

Items 41-44: Yes-No Responses and Written Comments (Insert Page)

**Please blacken the appropriate number on the answer sheet and write your comments in the spaces provided on this sheet of the instructional booklet.

41. Would you enroll in another dance course and/or recommend dance courses to others? (1) Yes (2) No
Comments:

42. Are you satisfied with what you got out of this dance course? (1) Yes (2) No
Comments:

43. Do you consider this course a valuable experience? (1) Yes (2) No
Comments:

44. Did this instructor help to make movement a pleasurable experience for you? (1) Yes (2) No
Comments:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

APPENDIX H:

ITEMS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY SECTION

The Instructor:

1. is enthusiastic.
2. motivates me to do my best work.
3. makes good use of examples and illustrations.
4. is not confused by unexpected questions.
5. is skilled in observing student reactions.
6. treats students with respect.
7. tells students when they have done well.
8. uses class time well.
9. has a realistic definition of good performance.
10. uses a variety of methods to present material.
11. exhibits distracting mannerisms.
12. accepts criticism and suggestions.
13. changes approaches to meet new situations.
14. appears to demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of dance at the appropriate level of technique.
15. uses humor effectively.
16. is able to give references for additional reading or research.
17. is patient when working with students.
18. makes me afraid to make mistakes.
19. is cynical and sarcastic.
20. positively interacts with students.
21. displays favoritism toward certain students.
22. uses a variety of teaching methods vs. a single method.
23. is sensitive to students responses when giving critiques.
24. is instrumental in raising my artistic values.

Course Assessment:

1. Work requirements and grading systems were clear from the beginning.
2 The amount of technique covered in this course is reasonable.
3. Written assignments are relevant to what is presented in class.
4. Reading assignments require a reasonable amount of time and effort.
5. The textbook makes a valuable contribution to the course.
6. Films used in this course are a great help to learning.
7. The use of videotapes is a great help to learning.
8. Examinations cover the important aspects of the course.

9. Exams are reasonable in length and difficulty.
10. Movement material was presented in a logical fashion.
11. Regular attendance was necessary for learning the course material.
12. Lectures were coordinated well with the movement technique.
13. The course has improved my aesthetic judgement.
14. The course gave me skills and techniques directly applicable to my career.

Personal Assessment:

1. I am developing my creative ability in this course.
2. I have greater appreciation for the art of dance as a result of this course.
3. I participate fully in all class sessions.
4. I am developing leadership skills in this class.
5. I am gaining a better understanding of myself through this course.
6. I am increasing my awareness of personal interests and talents.
7. I am developing a more positive self-concept because of this course.
8 I am developing skills needed by professionals in this field.

APPENDIX I:

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

I,_____, agree to participate in the doctoral research project titled A Survey of Student Evaluation of Teacher/Course Effectiveness Within Dance Technique Courses and the Development of New Instrumentation, which is being conducted by Deborah David Schubert. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time and have the results of participation removed from experimental records.

The following information has been made available to me in connection with participation in this research:

1. The reason for the research is to determine reliability and validity of the instrumentation developed within this study specific to measuring and improving instructor and course effectiveness within dance technique courses.

2. The procedures to be followed during participation are as follows: the student will respond on a separate answer sheet to questions on the evaluation form administered during a dance technique class period. Approximately one week later, the form will again be administered to ten students ramdomly chosen from the previous week.

3. Discomforts that may be faced during this project: none.

4. Participation entails the following risks: none.

5. The results of this participation are confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent.

6. The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, either now or during the course of the project.

7. The nature and purpose of this research project have been satisfactorily explained to me.

_____
Signature of Participant

APPENDIX J:

FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION FORM

**Please blacken one response number for each question on the answer sheet.

1. Rank/position:
(1) Grad. Teaching Assistant
(2) Instructor
(3) Lecturer
(4) Assistant Professor
(5) Associate Professor
(6) Full Professor
(7) Visiting Appointment
(8) Other

2. Number of years teaching experience (all levels of education):

(1) 0-2 yrs.
(2) 3-5
(3) 6-8
(4) 9-10
(5) 11-15
(6) 16-20
(7) 21-over

3. Interest in teaching this dance course before the semester/term:

(1) low (2) medium (3) high

4. Interest in teaching this dance course after the semester/term:

(1) low (2) medium (3) high

5. In your opinion, what percentage of the students enrolled in this course will enroll in another dance course and/or recommend the course to others?

(1) 0-20%
(2) 21-40%
(3) 41-50%
(4) 51-60%
(5) 61-70%
(6) 71-80%
(7) 81-90%
(8) 91-100%

**Please use the following scale to answer items 6 through 9.

(0) Not Applicable or Don't Know
(1) Excellent
(2) Very Good
(3) Satisfactory
(4) Poor
(5) Very Poor

6. Rate the students' effort in this course in comparison to other dance courses you have taught at this technique level.

7. In comparison to other dance courses, rate the students' overall technical level of ability in this course.

8. Rate your overall performance as instructor of this course.

9. Considering all of it's aspects, what rating would you give this course?

**Answer items 10-26 in the student evaluation pamphlet rating the course and yourself as instructor. Use the Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree scale.

General comments: You may use this space for any statements or concerns you wish to express related to your instruction and/or the course.